

JPRS 83050

10 March 1983

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No. 12, December 1982

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
No 12, December 1982

Russian title : MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE
OTNOSHENIYA

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : Ya. S. Khavinson

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : December 1982

Signed to press : 22 November 1982

Copies : 31,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya
ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

10 March 1983

USSR REPORT
WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No. 12, December 1982

Translation of the Russian-language monthly journal MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Table of Contents of 'MEMO' Journal, No 12, December 1982..... | 1 |
| English Summaries of Major Articles in 'MEMO' Journal..... | 3 |
| Western Investment, Loan Policies in Third World Criticized (A. A. Gromyko)..... | 6 |
| U.S. Approach to Detente Contrasted With W. European, Soviet Approach (G. Vorontsov)..... | 26 |
| New Edition of Book on Asian Economic Development Reviewed (O. Ul'rikh, V. Sheynis)..... | 41 |
| Book Criticizing Western Views of Third World Development Reviewed (I. Aleshina)..... | 55 |
| Book on Capitalist Economic Crisis Reviewed (V. Shchetinin)..... | 58 |
| Book on Capitalist Retail Trade Reviewed (R. Entov)..... | 62 |
| Index of Material Published in 'MEMO' in 1982..... | 65 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF 'MEMO' JOURNAL, NO 12, DECEMBER 1982

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 82 pp 1-2

| [Text] | Page |
|--|------|
| "Sixty Years of the USSR: Along the Path of Socialism, Peace and Internationalism" | 3 |
| A.A. Gromyko, "The Expansion of Capital and the Current Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism" | 15 |
| A. Shlepakov, "The National Question in the Capitalist World: Old Problems and New Realities" | 31 |
| G. Vorontsov, "Europe: Washington's Intrigues and the Imperatives of Security" | 45 |
| P. Zav'yalov, "International Cooperation of Capitalist Production and its Contradictions" | 58 |
| G. Naydenov, "Crisis of the Tax-Depreciation Regulation of the U.S. Economy" | 67 |
| 'MEMO' Roundtable | |
| Problems of West European Integration | 79 |
| Tribune of the economist and international affairs expert | |
| L. Gromov, Ye. Chetyrkin, "On the Question of the Inflationary Role of the Oil Price Increases" | 96 |
| Domestic Political Life Abroad | |
| V. Azhayeva, "Prospects of the Anti-Imperialist Struggle and Canada's New Democracy Party" | 109 |
| Contemporaneity and Current Affairs | |
| O. Ul'rikh, V. Sheynis, "Economic and Social Problems of the Oriental Developing Countries" | 114 |

Books, authors

| | |
|---|-----|
| N. Vasetskiy, "Response to 'Critics'" | 123 |
| O. Shabalina, "The CSSR: Improvement of the Structure of the National Economy" | 125 |
| I. Aleshina, "Problems of the Young States and the Groundlessness of Bourgeois Sociology" | 127 |
| V. Gavriluk, "The 'Cultural Aggression' of the Transnational Corporations" | 129 |
| R. Kapelyushnikov, "Education Prospects in the Developing Countries" | 131 |
| V. Shchetinin, "Incurable Ailment of the Capitalist System" | 133 |
| V. Romanova, "The Currency Crisis: Latest Aspects" | 135 |
| F. Bromberg, "Disproportions of the Development of Japan's Power Engineering" | 136 |
| R. Entov, "Contradictions in the Sphere of Capitalist Circulation" | 138 |
| N. Zaytsev, "The British Monopolies' Foreign Economic Expansion" | 139 |

Statistics

| | |
|---|-----|
| Unemployment in the Capitalist Countries | 141 |
| Index of articles and material published in the journal in 1982 | 148 |

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

8850

CSO: 1816/5

ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF MAJOR ARTICLES IN 'MEMO' JOURNAL

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 82 pp 158-159

[Text]

The editorial "60 Years of the USSR: Along the Path of Socialism, Peace and Internationalism" emphasizes that the formation of the USSR which took place five years after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution became a practical embodiment of Leninist ideas about the voluntary union of free nations which had thrown off the yoke of economic exploitation, social, political, national and cultural oppression. The fact that the almost two-thirds of a century-long existence of the first union of socialist nations is the result of the fundamental combination of the experience and wisdom of the CPSU which has led the peoples of our country from the victory of the Great October to the heights of a developed Socialist society, to the selfless heroic labour of the Soviet people, the monolithic socio-political and ideological unity of the Soviet society, indestructible cohesion of the Soviet people round its CPSU and Leninist Central Committee. The past sixty years have been marked by gigantic achievements of the Soviet people in all spheres of economic and social life of all socialist nations of the country, by the overcoming of the former backwardness of the outlying regions of tsarist Russia, by the building of relations of brotherhood, trust and mutual aid among more than a hundred peoples of the country. The principles of socialist internationalism constitute today also the basis of the relations among the peoples of the states of the Socialist community. The USSR at all stages of its history has always stood out as an active and firm champion of the cause of peace, of constructive international cooperation, as a champion of effective measures in favour of detente and disarmament. The very existence of the USSR, the reality of its achievements is a major factor of world development.

A.A. Gromyko in his article "Expansion of Capital and the Present Stage of General Crisis of Capitalism" analyses the actual economic and political changes in the world capitalist economy on the firm basis of the Leninist theory of imperialism. The author examines the imperialist intention to employ the internationalization processes attempting to enlarge the sphere of monopoly influence but leading only to the further aggravation of capitalist contradictions.

The outlined particulars of the capitalist expansion include at the present stage the following aspects. Primarily, the export of capital discovers the growing importance for the highly developed capitalist economies. Secondly, the capital expansion is marked by mounting aggressiveness translated into the violation of the international intercourse norms. This aggressiveness is to be hampered by the stirring up of the liberation movements, by peaceful coexistence policies of the socialist states. Thirdly, there's expanding connection between the export of capital and foreign imperialist policy stemming from the changing balance of forces on the international arena. Fourthly, the actual export of capital is characterized by the intensified exploitation of the recipient countries promoting for the augmentation of the monopolistic yields. The extortion of great amounts of financial resources from the developing countries by transnational corporations and banks limits the capability to overcome the economic and technological backwardness of the developing world. The emphasized trends in the export of capital found their vivid reflection in the expansion of American capital being the leading exporter. The U.S. experience in the reviewed field gives evidence to the deepening of the world capitalist economy contradictions.

A. Shlepakov in the article "The National Issue in the World of Capital: Old Problems and New Realities" shows that in the course of the historical evolution of capitalism the national issue in bourgeois society has not only lost its acuteness but acquired an ever louder ring. Of late the scale of international contradictions and the sphere of their manifestation has noticeably enlarged. The author stresses that under imperialism the internationalization of the most odious evils of bourgeois society, among which chauvinism and racial intolerance play a noticeable role, takes place. Moreover, trying to restore its extremely shaken positions in the world, imperialism deliberately kindles national and ethno-confessional discord and conflicts both in the citadels of capitalism and in its outlying areas thus making threat to international peace. Sharp contrast to the national discord and conflicts in the capitalist countries represent the relations of friendship of peoples under socialism. The author emphasizes that the entire history of the USSR gives a vivid confirmation of the teaching of the founders of scientific socialism that only with the vanishing of the antagonism of classes within nations will the hostile relations between nations disappear.

In the article "Europe: Washington's Intrigues and the Imperative of Security" G. Vorontsov argues that the unwillingness of the most aggressive U.S. imperialist circles to reconcile with the increasing political impact of real socialism, its economic and defensive might, with the approximate balance of military forces of the states of two social systems as well as the successes of the national-liberation movement and growing weight of the developing countries in world politics is deepening due to the increasing share of Western Europe and Japan in the capitalist system, resulting in the weakening of the U.S. positions and ever aggravating inter-imperialist contradictions. Europe, with its direct contiguity of states belonging to opposite social systems, with their military and political alliances, has been chosen by Washington to alter the strategic situation within regional and global limits, to strive for U.S. and NATO superiority over the USSR and Warsaw Treaty Organization, to try to shake the positions of socialism where they are the strongest. Special stress in the article is placed on the so-called "limited nuclear war" and the war with

the use of neutron and chemical weapons and Washington's attempt to save its own territory from a retaliatory blow. The author says that all-European cooperation is a natural process, which has taken shape in the course of many years and Europe with its fundamental economic, political and other interests in many respect objectively departs from the politics and aspirations of the U.S. administration. As far as international detente is concerned--its experience and achievements have become a historical gain of the peoples.

The article "International Co-operation of Capitalist Production and Its Contradictions" by P. Zavyalov is dedicated to one of the most important phenomenon of the world economy. The author investigates the objective prerequisites of the international production co-operation and also the modern features of its development backing his conclusions by considerable data. The main emphasis is placed on the qualitative shifts within the international relationship, closely linked with the impact of the scientific and technological revolution which effected the general conditions of the international competition.

Despite steady aggravation of the world economy contradictions, structural and cyclical crises the international production co-operations was marked by increasing dynamism translated into the emergence and further development of various forms of production interaction. Subcontracting, contract specialization, joint entrepreneurship permit to mobilize material resources, skilled personnel along with the reduction of the individual production costs and the diminuation of the terms necessary for the new products commercialization.

The international production co-operation intensifies the integrational movements in the world capitalist economy. But the benefits of the capitalist production co-operation are of temporary and particular character. The partial consolidation of resources within the narrow framework of monopolistic groupings often contradicts with national interests. Determined by the uneliminated anarchy of capitalist production the international cooperation is nothing but unstable and transitional phase to the new sharpening of the imperialist competition.

G. Naidenov in the article "The Crisis of Fiscal and Depreciation Regulation of the U.S. Economy" dwells upon the essence and the forms of the legislative moves to use taxation tools for the productive capital formation. Regarding the particulars of the 1981 tax reform, namely the expansion of the "investment tax credit" procedure and drastic changes in the depreciation mechanism, the author outlines that this reform is purported to secure the profits of the monopoly capital in the long run. Thus, the fiscal policy actually represents the disguised method to subsidize the business as well as the regulation of the depreciation schedules facilitates the accumulation of monopoly profits, free of tax.

Referring to the quantitative estimates of the American economists and the assembled empirical evidence, dating to the postwar period, the author arrives to the conclusion that the legislative mechanism promoting fiscal manoeuvres exert significant influence on the accumulation of money capital, which can not be used for productive goals under the unfavourable conditions. First of all, it's accounted for by the high rate of the productive capacities. The fiscal and depreciation policies directed to foster the economic recovery contribute to the aggravation of some capitalist reproduction contradictions.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

WESTERN INVESTMENT, LOAN POLICIES IN THIRD WORLD CRITICIZED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 82 pp 15-30

[Article by A.A. Gromyko: "The Expansion of Capital and the Current Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism"; capitalized words printed in boldface in original]

[Text] Marxist-Leninist science is the basis of an analysis of the fundamental trends of world development and the concrete forms of international relations in the modern era.

The role of the export of capital as a principal indication of imperialism was shown by V.I. Lenin, who made an in-depth analysis of capitalism at its highest, imperialist, stage of development. As V.I. Lenin emphasized, the export of capital "acquired outstanding significance" with capitalism's growth into imperialism.*

This evaluation of Lenin's is also fully applicable to the export of American capital since World War II, when it has assumed unprecedented proportions and U.S. monopoly capital's claims to the leading role in the world have become particularly obvious.

More than ever before numerous American loans, credit and various types of so-called economic and military "assistance" are being used in the interests of the economic and political enslavement of other countries and peoples. The scale of the expansion of the transnational corporations [TNC] is unprecedented. The role of the military-industrial complex has increased. The aggressive nature of American monopoly capital, which has become a principal source of militarism and military danger in the world, has increased considerably.

Administrations in the White House have changed. The political slogans of the leading bourgeois parties have changed. Priorities in policy have been adjusted. But the export of capital has always occupied a prominent place in the activity of American business and U.S. administrations. They resort to encouraging it to strengthen the positions of the actual masters of America--the monopolies--and to secure their global interests.

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 27, p 387.

At the same time, however, the U.S. Administration has always attempted to use investments abroad as a kind of lever, with which it hopes to turn the development of international events in a direction advantageous to its policy. It is natural. A government of the monopolies operates in accordance with the logic dictated by the monopolies and determined by their criteria and concepts. An author has already written about this in the works "Export of American Capital" and "Expansion of the Dollar".*

We cannot fail to note that never before have the most expansionist forces of monopoly capital used the power of the state so candidly and directly for the defense of their interests and never before has their political philosophy been carried over so directly and unceremoniously into the program declarations and practical actions of government figures of the leading Western countries, primarily the United States, as is the case at present.

The "adventurism, rudeness and unconcealed egoism," as L.I. Brezhnev defined this feature of American policy,** are giving rise to growing indignation in many countries, among the United States' allies included.

The attempts to take advantage of the singularities of the current stage of the internationalization of capitalist production and capital and the specific features of the forms and methods of the present stage of state-monopoly regulation to justify a kind of "renaissance" of the Wild West era of colonization on the American continent based on ruthless exploitation pursue the goal of foisting the Pax Americana philosophy on the whole world, heeding neither the will of the peoples nor the revolutionary changes occurring in the world.

I

In our time, when socialism has become firmly established on a significant part of the globe and is developing constantly, when forces advocating the progressive transformation of society within the capitalist states are growing and when the struggle for national liberation in many countries is growing into a struggle against the entire system of exploitation and oppression, the historical hopelessness of imperialism is even more obvious. With every justification the Lenin Party has drawn the important theoretical conclusion that imperialism has irretrievably lost power over the majority of mankind.

An irreversible, objectively conditioned process of decomposition has embraced capitalism from its foundation to its summit: its economic and state system and policy and ideology. The very basis of this final exploiter system--capital, as a system of social production relationships, whether primary, existing in the production process, or "SECONDARY AND TERTIARY and altogether DERIVED, TRANSFERRED nonprimary production relationships"*** manifested in the international sphere--is in a state of crisis.

* See G. Andreyev, "Eksport Amerikanskogo kapitala. Iz istorii eksporta kapitala SShA kak orudiya ekonomicheskoy i politicheskoy ekspansii" [Export of American Capital. From the History of the Export of U.S. Capital as an Instrument of Economic and Political Expansion], Moscow, 1957; G. Andreyev, "Ekspansiya dollara" [Expansion of the Dollar], Moscow, 1961.

** See PRAVDA 28 October 1982.

*** See K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 12, p 735.

The comprehensive scientific analysis of imperialism made by V.I. Lenin serves as a key to an understanding of the crisis and the contradictions which are being manifested at the present stage of capitalism's development and which affect the very system of capitalist production relationships, individual national economies and the complex of international, including foreign economic, relations.

The Marxist-Leninist conclusion concerning the historically doomed nature of bourgeois society and the inevitability of the collapse of the domination of the capitalist class is well known. "It would be impossible to end the domination of capitalism if the entire economic development of the capitalist countries were not leading toward this," V.I. Lenin observed.* The social production forces which have arisen within the private-ownership form of bourgeois production relationships will inevitably outgrow this shell and enter into a conflict with it which is insurmountable under the conditions of the bourgeois society.

The 26th CPSU Congress pointed to the FURTHER EXACERBATION OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM and in this connection noted the historical futility of various bourgeois reforms designed to save capitalism and, correspondingly, the system of international relations which it has created.

Capitalism is manifestly incapable of coping with the most profound contradictions which it has engendered. However, the activeness of the efforts in search of increasingly new "miraculous prescriptions," which if not immediately curing capitalism of its ailments, then at least promising "light at the end of the tunnel," does not diminish. There have been many of them in past decades, and each such "prescription" promised to put an end to the severe disorders and defects. However, sooner or later life showed their groundlessness both for the domestic economy and for the system of international relations.

Supporters of so-called supply-side economics, A. Laffer, R. Mandell and N. Ture, who have come out with "prescriptions" for the recovery of the sick U.S. economy, have, for example, been attempting to publicize their views extensively recently. The views of the representatives of this school have been expressed most fully by G. Gilder in the book "Wealth and Poverty".** There has been a rush to christen this work of G. Gilder's the "handbook" of economists of the Reagan school and the U.S. President himself.

The theoretical resources of the above-mentioned group of experts are impoverished and the outline of a way out of the difficulties is distinguished by primitive straightforwardness. The supporters of the said concept themselves term it a compendium of ideas expressed earlier and measures of state policy "officially approved" in the past. This collection of political economy views and political recommendations may sooner be called not a theory and not even a primer but a kind of study aid for defenders of so-called supply-side economics.

The illusory nature of the hopes connected with this concept is being confirmed both in theory and in practice. Bourgeois economists themselves who worked

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 32, p 99.

** See G. Gilder, "Wealth and Poverty," New York, 1981.

under previous administrations had spoke of its groundlessness long before its official proclamation. Now it is being called in question increasingly often by experts serving the present administration also.

It is worth noting that even the journal AMERICA (November 1981), which responded promptly in the performance of its duty with material on the new U.S. Administration's economic views and which reprinted extracts from G. Gilder's book, did not consider it possible to conceal serious skepticism concerning such views on the part of many economists and representatives of American business, whose "prosperity" the economic concepts of the R. Reagan administration are designed to serve.

Incidentally, hopes that an abandonment of "economic experimenting" and a return to the former Keynesian methods could rectify the situation would be illusory also. The groundlessness of the theoretical concepts of G. Gilder and others is corroborated to an even greater extent by the practical results of business's bossing of the show: the continuing growth of economic difficulties in the United States, the huge unemployment and so forth.

G. Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, emphasizes in this connection that, having done away with all the concessions inherent in Keynesian economics, the R. Reagan administration is replacing it by what may be called the "economics of monopoly highway robbery".

The singularities of the current state of capitalism noted at the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses have been caused by the characteristic features of the present era of the struggle of the two systems--socialist and capitalist--and the unprecedented growth of anti-imperialist forces throughout the world.

Capital may perform its role in the policy and international relations of the world capitalist system of the end of the 20th century only on a constricted basis as a consequence of the fundamental changes introduced to the world by the Great October Socialist Revolution. And the further the influence of these changes is being reflected, it is being reflected to a greater extent. "...We have a right to be proud," V.I. Lenin wrote, "and we are proud that it is our good fortune to BEGIN the building of the Soviet state and thereby BEGIN a new era of world history, the era of the domination of a NEW class, which is oppressed in all capitalist countries and which is proceeding everywhere toward a new life, toward victory over the bourgeoisie, toward dictatorship of the proletariat and toward man's salvation from the yoke of capital and from imperialist wars."*

The attempts to prevent the removal of capitalist production relationships with the help of state-monopoly measures of regulation of the economy, assisting the development of the TNC and the introduction of the latest scientific-technical achievements are leading only to the appearance of new contradictions and an intensification of the old ones. Historically these attempts cannot save capitalism as a sociopolitical system. The formation and growth of the

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 44, p 148.

world socialist system, the upsurge of the national liberation movement of the peoples and the struggle of the working people of the capitalist countries for their rights constantly confirm the soundness of this Marxist-Leninist conclusion.

This conclusion is of undoubted significance for theory and practice. But no less important for science and practice (particularly international) is also the fact that capitalism, as emphasized by the 25th and 26th CPSU congresses, has not become frozen in its development; it has many resources. However, their use is of a profoundly antipopular nature and fully reflects capitalism's exploiter essence. Attention is drawn to this singularity of the modern development of capitalism in the CPSU Central Committee report at the 26th party congress, which speaks of the need "to comprehend certain new phenomena in the capitalist world, particularly the singularity of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism, and the sharp growth of the role of the military-industrial complex and the TNC."

Of course, none of capitalism's available resources is capable of removing the doomed nature of capitalism as a social system and, even less, of halting human society's progressive development. But these resources could put off the final collapse of capitalism in this part of the capitalist world or the other, deform social progress in this country or the other and distort from the viewpoint of the historical perspective its development paths, at a costly price for mankind, possibly.

The dimensions of this price are determined not only by the losses which the peoples, primarily the working people's masses, are forced to bear constantly as a result of their exploitation by capital, of which kind--supermonopoly or nonmonopoly capital, local capital or that which has invaded from abroad--is not in principle that important. Of particular danger for mankind is the fact that in an endeavor not to come to a halt in its development, to grow and to derive profit capital is resorting to means among which primarily are militarism, the arms race and the threat to use military force to defend its purely class-based goals, the more so when they are being elevated to the rank of so-called "vital interests". The arms race unleashed by monopoly capital has already entailed colossal expenditure for mankind. There could be a manifold increase in this expenditure and the military danger could increase even more if insurmountable barriers are not put in the way of the aspirations of military-industrial business.

Reflecting the interests of capital, the concept of world development and international relations is thus fundamentally contrary to the vital aspirations of the peoples. "Adventurism and a readiness to gamble with man's vital interests in the name of their narrow selfish goals--this is what is being revealed particularly brazenly in the policy of the most aggressive circles of imperialism," the 26th CPSU Congress pointed out.

All the greater is the significance of the peace-loving foreign policy program of the CPSU adopted at the 24th and developed at the 25th CPSU congresses and the set of proposals put forward at the 26th CPSU Congress and which have come to be called among the peoples the Peace Program for the 1980's. Here also is incontrovertible testimony that socialism and peace are indivisible.

The more extensive and intensive use of foreign markets with the help of the export of capital is also a means of the development of capitalism and, consequently, potential for its growth. A solution of their problems thanks to foreign expansion and foreign, particularly as yet unused, markets has also been an attractive motive for the activity of the monopolies.

By means of the export of capital the monopolies are strengthening their power, obtaining higher-than-usual profits, which graphically manifests cosmopolitan aspirations. The fact that capitalism has been feeding some of its "own" workers, primarily of the metropolis countries, thanks to overseas profits has not changed the heart of the matter for the export of capital invariably helps it increase the exploitation of the "beneficiary" proletarians of its own country. The founders of Marxism-Leninism emphasized the existence of an impassable gulf between the bourgeoisie and the working people, irrespective of the position this nation or the other occupies in the world.

For example, the export of capital by the American monopolists, particularly in the form of loans and credit, means the plundering not only of the countries which serve as the subject of the export of capital but also of the people of the United States. The export of direct and portfolio production investments abroad facilitates the monopolies' offensive against the working people's rights. The export of loan capital also leads to these same results. There is a deterioration in the terms of the sale of labor and a growth of unemployment. The export of capital along state channels is directly or indirectly connected with increased tax oppression. To grant this state or the other financial "assistance" it is necessary to obtain certain resources. In particular, the capitalists achieve this either by way of the increasing exploitation of the working people at their "own," national enterprises or withhold part of the income--also primarily from the working population of their country--by way of taxes and a variety of imposts.

In the process of support for the monopolies' foreign expansion a certain burden is also imposed on other strata of the population, including the part of business which is forced to pay for the international transactions of its more monopolized and internationalized "colleagues". This, naturally, causes friction and conflict within the class of the bourgeoisie. So it was earlier also, but within the framework of so-called Reaganomics this friction and conflict are aggravated inasmuch as the wealthiest monopolies engaged in big international transactions are obtaining particularly high profits.

Nor is the U.S. monopolies' imposition of unequal relations on their partners from other capitalist countries a new phenomenon. It occurred earlier also, particularly in the practice of the United States' economic relations with the Latin American countries. Currently, however, this has become the rule, which testifies to the increased aggressiveness of U.S. monopoly capital and its endeavor to use foreign economic relations in general, particularly the export of capital, to underpin its shaken positions. What is new is the fact that in having proclaimed supply-side economics as its goal the U.S. Administration is today demanding that foreign countries adopt the American "prescriptions," primarily recognition of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism in policy as conditions for obtaining American capital and technology.*

* See U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT 26 October 1981, p 20.

However, none of the attempts to use the export of capital to strengthen the international positions of imperialism, particularly of the main exporters of capital, can change the state of affairs. The system of capitalism's international relations is in a state of ever-deepening crisis reflecting the organic incapacity of the last exploiter system for surmounting the difficulties and resolving the contradictions which it itself has engendered, by virtue of the immanent laws of its development.

II

New features are being revealed in the contemporary export of capital. Some of them have been developed from the characteristic singularities inherent in this form of imperialist expansion in general, others reflect the modern singularities of world development.

First, an appreciable growth of the significance of the export of capital for highly developed state-monopoly capitalism as a consequence of the accelerated internationalization of its positions and the increased global pretensions of the biggest monopolies is observed.

Prior to World War I practically the entire export of capital was effected thanks to resources mobilized on the domestic money market. Subsequently the role of small-scale and medium-scale business in the export of resources abroad has been diminishing. Big monopoly alliances are becoming the direct exporter. Foreign investments are concentrated in the hands of a tight circle of the biggest monopolies. In the 1970's, for example, less than 200 American monopolies had more than two-thirds of the country's foreign capital investments. Of course, this is not only characteristic of the United States but also of other big imperialist states, where the concentration of the export of capital in the hands of the leading monopolies is also growing rapidly.

Accordingly, there has been a considerable increase in the scale of the export of capital and the amounts of the foreign investments belonging to the biggest, primarily transnational, monopolies and transnational banks. From 1914 through the end of World War II the foreign capital investments of the main capitalist countries grew by approximately one-third. In the postwar period the volume of foreign capital investments has doubled practically every decade.* The growth has differed with respect to the different forms of the export of capital. As far as direct investments are concerned, for example, an even more rapid growth has been observed in the last 15 years--a doubling every 6-7 years.

The bulk of foreign investments is concentrated in the industrially developed part of the capitalist world, leaving the majority of developing states in the position of stepsons of scientific-technical progress. It is characteristic that the industrially developed countries account for more than half of new direct investments, that is, these resources and technologies do not go beyond the confines of the zone of industrially developed capitalist countries.

* See "The Political Economy of Modern Monopoly Capitalism," vol 2, Moscow 1975, p 73.

In 1978, for example, the net export of new direct investments from this group of countries constituted more than \$30.9 billion and the net import over \$20 billion. In 1978-1980 such U.S. investments abroad increased on an annual average by \$19.5 billion, and foreign direct investments in the United States grew by an annual \$10.2 billion simultaneously.* As the West's leading economists write, a growth of "interdependence" among a relatively tight group of industrial capitalist countries is being observed (see Table 1). At the same time repeated attempts are being made with the help of the export of capital to unify the interests and policy of the monopolies of different countries, including the incipient (monopoly included) business of the developing countries. However, the plans are not destined to be realized, which has been shown by the incapacity of capitalism and the limited nature of its potential and resources for securing decisions which are to its strategic advantage.

The lack of the desired class unity under the aegis of the West's monopolies is forcing imperialism to resort to "traditional" means. Together with the growth of the export of capital to the emergent states, which is designed to secure the imperialist monopolies' economic, political and social interests, the West, primarily the United States, is resorting increasingly extensively for this purpose to the use of crude force and aggressive methods. As practice shows, it is not averse to using such methods in respect of other countries also. L.I. Brezhnev observed at the 26th CPSU Congress in this connection: "Imperialist circles think in the categories of domination and compulsion in respect of other states and peoples."

The said circumstances do not change the above-mentioned endeavor of the monopolies to strengthen with the help of the export of capital the positions of highly developed state-monopoly capitalism within the imperialist powers and within the framework of the entire world capitalist economy as a whole.

Table 1. Distribution of Direct U.S. Investments

| | Sum total (\$ millions) | | | Proportion (%) | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------|---------|----------------|------|------|
| | 1950 | 1980 | 1981 | 1950 | 1980 | 1981 |
| All | 11,788 | 213,469 | 227,343 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| including | | | | | | |
| -in the developed capitalist countries | 5,696 | 157,084 | 167,112 | 48.3 | 73.6 | 73.5 |
| -in the developing countries | 5,736 | 52,684 | 56,109 | 48.7 | 24.7 | 24.7 |

Second, the aggressive nature of the export of capital is growing appreciably. This aggressiveness is expressed in the very methods of the penetration of foreign capital under current conditions as a consequence of its incapacity for securing profitable investment other than by way of the flagrant violation of the fundamental rules of international intercourse, the flouting of the principles of equality and mutual benefit and the undermining of the foundations of national sovereignty and the freedom and independence of the peoples.

* UN Doc. E/C. 10/1982/2, 16 July 1982, p 5.

As is known, in this struggle the Japanese and West European monopolies are competing increasingly successfully with American capital, on the United States' domestic market included. In the 1970's the United States' share of world exports declined almost 20 percent, and this decline was, furthermore, predetermined to a considerable extent by the deterioration in the American monopolies' positions in the sphere of international investments. The aggressiveness of the competitors is growing particularly and becoming more ruthless in connection with the fact that the dominant role in this struggle belongs to the TNC, of which American monopolies constitute a significant proportion.

Besides the factors concentrated in the centers of highly developed state-monopoly capitalism, the singularities of the position of less developed countries are also being manifested in the growth of the aggressiveness of international investing. This reserve of capitalism is maintained at the present time also, and the export of capital is helping the monopolies use it to secure the interests of state-monopoly capital. However, the mobilization of this reserve is becoming increasingly difficult for capitalism as a consequence of the growth of the forces of national liberation, the increasingly large number of countries opting for the path of progressive development (including those of a socialist orientation) and the strengthening of the emergent countries' all-around relations with the socialist world.

Aggressiveness is becoming the final means ensuring the investment of capital abroad, which is essential for imperialist circles. The 26th CPSU Congress observed: "Demonstrating total disregard for the rights and cherished aspirations of the peoples, they are attempting to portray the liberation struggle of the people's masses as a manifestation of 'terrorism'. They have truly set themselves the goal of attaining the unattainable--erecting a barrier in the way of progressive changes in the world and restoring to themselves the role of arbiters of the peoples' fate."

This aggressiveness acquires all the more obvious features in that it is directly connected with the activity of the military-industrial complex and the monopolies' global militarist plans.

The policy of the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries with respect to the capitalist states has been and continues to be determined by the struggle for a lasting peace, the establishment of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the easing and, in the future, the removal of the danger of the outbreak of a new world war. "THERE IS NOW NO MORE IMPORTANT TASK INTERNATIONALLY FOR OUR PARTY, OUR PEOPLE AND FOR ALL PEOPLES OF THE PLANET," L.I. Brezhnev emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress, "THAN DEFENDING PEACE."

The socialist community countries together with other peace-loving forces have scored considerable successes in the consistent struggle for peace and the relaxation of international tension. The biggest is the fact that they have been able to break up the tragic world war-short peaceful interlude-new world war cycle, which secures for capital a redistribution of world markets and spheres of influence in accordance with the new correlation of forces.

The following calculations made by the Club of Rome on the basis of ILO data testify to the importance of this change for the fate of peace and the

possibilities which are revealed in this connection. Given the existing population growth rate, by the year 2000 it will be necessary to create over 1 billion new jobs, which, given average expenditure per job of \$40,000, will require trillions of dollars.* Even if it is considered that the cost per job is lower in the developing countries, additional investments will still amount to sums of several hundred billion dollars. But this is less than is currently spent for military purposes!

Whence the particular significance which is attached to the program for securing peace, peaceful cooperation, limitation of the arms race and disarmament which has been put forward by the Soviet Union. For unemployed people living in poverty and on the verge of starvation, and in today's world the total number of them is several hundred million, realization of the Soviet initiatives is the way to the preservation of life in the face of the threat of nuclear war and to survival.

The exploiter essence of the export of capital and its close connection with the military-aggressive aspirations of the monopolies are manifested with sufficient clarity here.

Third, the increased interconnection of the export of capital and the foreign policy of the imperialist powers is observed, and it is of an extremely contradictory nature, moreover, since it reflects the big changes which have occurred not only in finance-industrial capital itself but also in the correlation of forces in the international arena and the strengthening of the forces of socialism and national liberation.

Life has fully confirmed the soundness of Lenin's approach to an analysis of the role of the export of capital in imperialist policy. Speaking at the present time of the export of capital means examining the international expansion of a tight group of industrially developed capitalist countries. Of the sum total of direct private investments of roughly \$450-460 billion, the United States, Great Britain, the FRG, Switzerland, Japan, the Netherlands, France and Canada account for more than nine-tenths. As we can see, the most powerful and influential countries of the capitalist world and the three centers of world capitalism--the United States, West Europe and Japan--are incorporated here.

The adduced list represents the leading nucleus of the group of Western countries in the United States and three permanent members of the Security Council from the Western powers. The group of main exporters of capital almost completely coincides with the composition of the participants in the annual meetings of leaders of Western countries, who coordinate at these conferences the basic parameters of their policy. Here are the principal participants in all the leading military-political and economic organizations and international institutions of capitalism; the main forces determining military-political strategy and economic conditions and the backbone of the military-industrial complex. The said group of countries has all the leading TNC.

* See O. Giardini, "Dialogue on Wealth and Welfare: An Alternative View of World Capital Formation. A Report to the Club of Rome," Oxford, 1980, pp 160-161.

At the same time while claiming the role of the "locomotives" of the capitalist economy the main capital-exporting countries are in practice a source of the acute upheavals and fulcrum of the insoluble contradictions of capitalist production. "The difficulties being experienced by capitalism," the 26th CPSU Congress emphasized, "are also influencing its policy, including its foreign policy. The struggle surrounding the main questions of the capitalist countries' foreign policy has been exacerbated."

For the purpose of the systematic exploitation of the working people of various countries the monopolies are gambling via the foreign policy machinery on the most aggressive and reactionary forces. Assistance to the export of capital is on a par with support for military-militarist regimes, all kinds of antipopular groups and the forces of racism and apartheid.

The peoples are advocating increasingly emphatically the reorganization of international relations on a just, democratic basis. However, as L.I. Brezhnev observed, "the imperialists, the direct descendants of those who with iron, fire and blood turned free peoples into slavery and who plundered and oppressed them for decades, are reluctant to reconcile themselves to this. They are attempting to impose on the international community their concept of practices in the world. Such a concept, which would justify neocolonialist plunder and methods of diktat and violence, would untie their hands for the suppression of national liberation movements. Our position in these matters is diametrically opposite."*

The deception to which the diplomacy of the bourgeois states resorts is strikingly expressed in the sharp contradiction between the officially declared principles and goals of their foreign policy on the one hand and measures which are actually being implemented on the other. While proclaiming outwardly noble principles and goals, these countries' ruling circles frequently endeavor under such a cover to disguise their true intentions and actions in international affairs and thereby conceal the very essence of their diplomacy, which is alien to the peoples, and its service of the goals of seizure, international oppression and the increased exploitation of its own people and the goals of an aggressive and hegemonist foreign policy. References to moral principles to justify an antipopular foreign policy course were employed extensively by bourgeois diplomacy before also. But never before were the interests of business passed off so straightforwardly as all-state, national interests!

"The American corporations' need to expand their investments and protect their markets has led to such different consequences as the U.S. intervention in Vietnam, the Marshall Plan for West Europe and American intervention against the Salvador Allende leftwing regime in Chile"--these words of the American historian W. Williams point correctly as a whole to the deep-lying connection between the interests of big business and U.S. foreign policy.**

* PRAVDA 13 May 1981.

** U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT 25 January 1982, p 44.

At the same time it has to be noted that it is becoming increasingly difficult for the monopolies to use the international movement of capital for the purposes of imperialist policy. As L.I. Brezhnev emphasized, "the policy of peaceful coexistence, which was outlined by V.I. Lenin even, is exerting an increasingly determining influence on modern international relations."

Some influential business circles of the West are consenting to the development of cooperation with the USSR and other socialist community countries. Such constructive business cooperation, which is based on the principles of noninterference, respect for sovereignty, a fair consideration of the partners' interests and mutual benefit, has become a factor of modern international relations exerting a restraining influence on the aggressive aspirations of the monopolies and the uncontrolled expansion of capital. This fact is of particular significance for the emergent countries, which are interested in obtaining from abroad resources and technology to secure their economic progress and strengthen political independence.

And, fourth and finally, a characteristic feature of the contemporary export of capital is its increased exploiter essence. It is this goal which is served by the above-mentioned singularities of the export of capital--the increased significance for state-monopoly capitalism, the increase in aggressive principles, including the extensive use of militarism, and the increased interconnection with foreign policy and diplomacy.

The most obvious manifestation of the increased exploitation with the help of the export of capital consists of the huge payments which the so-called "recipient" countries make to the exporters of capital. For example, in the developing countries foreign investors annually obtain profits constituting one-fourth-one-fifth of the total sum of direct investments. The new inflow of investments is far less than the sum of profit transferred abroad, which also testifies to the systematic exploitation of the corresponding countries with the aid of foreign capital. As a result the developing countries prove to be not recipients of resources but net payers to the benefit of the industrially developed countries. In the crisis year of 1981 profits from American direct investments in the developed capitalist countries declined compared with 1980 from \$12.2 billion to \$11.1 billion, but from the developing countries grew from \$7.5 billion to \$7.6 billion.

Both direct investments and also loan capital more readily go to countries with a higher income level, which predetermines the great profitability of these investments. For example, in the period 1978-1980 over 50 percent of the direct investments were concentrated in the developing countries where GNP was in excess of \$1,000 per capita per annum (the less developed countries with an income not in excess of \$400 per capita accounted for 5 percent of such investments).

In the sphere of loan capital the picture is even more expressive: in 1978 the most developed countries of this group received two-thirds of all loans, while the least developed received 1 percent (!). The picture has not changed subsequently.

Table 2. New Direct Investments and Profit Transferred Abroad* (\$ millions)

| | New Direct Investments | Profit |
|------|------------------------|--------|
| 1967 | 1,141 | 4,254 |
| 1971 | 2,400 | 7,192 |
| 1972 | 1,776 | 6,230 |
| 1973 | 4,060 | 9,374 |
| 1974 | 203 | 10,776 |
| 1975 | 7,683 | 9,644 |
| 1976 | 4,275 | 11,448 |
| 1977 | 6,875 | 14,046 |
| 1978 | 6,788 | 16,691 |

* Data for 62 developing countries.

Estimated from "Balance of Payments Yearbook," IMF; "Development Cooperation," OECD for the corresponding years.

An indicator of increased exploitation is also the change in the policy of the main private investors--the TNC. Direct foreign investments remain an important source of industrial financing for many developing countries. They remain the main and traditional channel of the TNC's penetration of these countries. Throughout the 1970's the flow of direct foreign capital investments from the developed capitalist countries to the developing countries increased on an annual average of 15 percent nominally and 4 percent in real terms.

Capital into the developing countries moves mainly along industrial TNC channels: from the United States and Canada (50 percent of all private capital in the 1970's), West Europe (38 percent) and Japan (10 percent). As a result of the vigorous expansion primarily of the Japanese companies, which are increasingly operating in an alliance with the American companies, the West European countries' share here fell from 50 percent in the 1960's to 38 percent in the 1970's. The Japanese group of TNC is presently proving to be the most dynamic group penetrating the developing countries (mainly Asian). Japanese expansion is aimed here at the quest for new sales markets and for providing national industry with raw material and energy. Thus the monopolies distinguished by the most expansionist features are gaining the ascendancy.

Thanks to the increased activity precisely of the American and Japanese group of companies, there was a pronounced increase in the 1970's in the flow of private capital into Central America and the Caribbean (Mexico, Panama, Trinidad and Tobago, Bermuda, the Bahamas and the Antilles) and Asian countries (India, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore). By the end of the 1970's they were among the leading geographical areas of TNC activity in volume of private investments (more than 50 percent of total investments in the developing countries).

South America (up to 25 percent of the investments in developing countries) was also an important sphere of TNC activity, although there was a pronounced decline in this region's role in the 1970's. The significance for the TNC of Africa and the Near East also declined in this same period (from 20 to 15 percent and from

10 to 4 percent respectively). Thus there was a marked regrouping in the composition of the TNC themselves throughout the 1970's.

The appreciable change in the structure of private capital was connected with this "novelty" in the nature of the TNC's economic expansion in the developing countries. An important new source of the private financing of the developing countries emerged in the 1970's--the transnational banks. By 1978 the total sum of loans granted by way of these banks (particularly Eurocredits) had risen to almost \$44 billion.* As a result the proportion of private industrial investments in the total inflow of private capital fell from 50 percent in the 1960's to less than one-third in the 1970's. In 1979 the volume of loans granted the developing countries was greater than the sum total of investments of industrial significance. All these changes led to a further increase in the exploiter nature of TNC activity in the developing countries.

There was a decline in the proportion of production capital in the total inflow of private capital since the loans granted by the transnational banks serve to a considerable extent to cover the developing countries' balance of payments deficits and to pay off past debt. In the developing countries' expenditure the paying off of debt is now assuming ever increasing significance. There has been a marked shift in the structure of imported capital toward nonproductive loan capital. This means that there are diminished opportunities for the developing countries for obtaining the useful scientific-technical information and managerial and organizational experience which usually accompanies the export of production capital.

The increased proportion of loan capital is leading not only to a decline in the rate of the transfer of technology but also, which is highly important, to an increase in the volume of resources being pumped out of the developing countries. Approximately \$16 billion were transferred from these countries to the developed capitalist states in 1979 in the form of profit on production investments.** The same year debt and bank loan interest payments were more than twice as much as the said profit total. Ultimately this leads to an increase in the rate of capital resources being pumped out of the developing countries paid out \$8 billion in 1971 and \$75 billion in 1980.*** Is this not an indicator of the exploitative nature of the loans, credits and other indirect forms of the export of capital to the developing countries. Capital is also pumped out of the developing countries along other lines also.

However, the scale of the exploiter activity is measured not only by quantitative indicators. We have mentioned above the attempts of state-monopoly capitalism to use the export of capital to attach to the policy of the leading monopolies in this form or the other the groups of monopoly capital which do not participate in foreign economic expansion or exercise it on a limited scale. The attachment to the overall flow of expansion of the capital of other countries also, including the developing states themselves, has been mentioned.

* UN Doc., E/C. 10/74, 16 May 1980, p 13.

** See "Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics. Supplement 1980/UNCTAD," United Nations, New York, 1980, p 250.

*** U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT 26 October 1981, p 23.

This deformed and antipopular "partnership" of capital is made fast by various means of state-monopoly support. Nonreturnable "assistance," the incorporation of elements of subsidy in the traditional forms of the export of capital and various methods of encouraging the export of capital in cases where the political, economic and social conditions in a foreign country are inadequate for its "spontaneous" and "independent" advancement--all these are being adapted by state-monopoly capitalism in order to make the expansion of capital possible and efficient, despite the deepening general crisis of capitalism.

Thus economic "assistance" is simply a means of supporting one's own investments and winning new positions for the monopolies. The "price" paid by different industrially developed capitalist countries here varies. And, of course, is not exhausted by the totals adduced in the table since besides economic there is also military "assistance" and other means of securing the international interests of their monopolies.

Table 3. Scale of Economic "Assistance" to the Developing Countries (1980)

| | \$ millions | % of GNP |
|-----------------|-------------|----------|
| United States | 7,091 | 0.27 |
| France | 4,041 | 0.62 |
| The FRG | 3,518 | 0.43 |
| Japan | 3,304 | 0.32 |
| Great Britain | 1,785 | 0.34 |
| The Netherlands | 1,577 | 0.99 |
| Canada | 1,036 | 0.42 |
| Sweden | 923 | 0.76 |
| Italy | 678 | 0.17 |
| Australia | 657 | 0.48 |
| Belgium | 575 | 0.48 |
| Norway | 473 | 0.82 |
| Denmark | 464 | 0.72 |
| Switzerland | 246 | 0.24 |
| Austria | 174 | 0.23 |

Source: U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT 26 October 1981, p 23.

In now investing capital abroad for the purpose of the systematic appropriation of the surplus value produced by foreign countries' working people the monopolies are at the same time exploiting the working people of their own countries and also to a certain extent other strata of the population at home and abroad. The growing conflict between the upper stratum of monopoly business and the rest of capitalist society as a whole is now being manifested more in the sphere of the export of capital than anywhere else.

Increasingly great significance is attached to a study of the trends of the development of the export of capital since they on the one hand affect the entire system of state-monopoly capitalism and, on the other, reveal certain new phenomena in the capitalist world.

Particular significance in this respect is attached to a study of the export of capital from the United States--the biggest capitalist country. The United States is in first place in the scale of the export of capital. Currently approximately half of all direct private investments of the capitalist world are American.

The export of U.S. capital is characterized by the most reactionary principles in the international policy of present-day imperialism, primarily subordination to the interests of the military-industrial complex. American imperialism would not be able to pretend to the role of "world policeman" if it did not dispose of multibillion-dollar businesses abroad.

American capital did not capture these positions all at once. Its expansion began in the final third of the 19th century, which was caused by the rapid development of capitalism not only in Britain and France but also in the United States, Germany and Japan. The assimilation of internal territory had been completed, in the main, in all the leading capitalist countries. At the same time the process of the concentration and centralization of capital led to the formation of monopoly alliances and the emergence of a vast "surplus of capital" in these states, which was directed abroad, primarily to the economically backward countries.*

Whereas prior to the final third of the 19th century the export of capital had been an isolated phenomenon and Britain and France were virtually the sole exporters of capital, at the end of the 19th century there was a "breakthrough" as a consequence of the above-mentioned singularities of the development of capitalism. A rapid growth of the export of capital was observed, and it was being exported by many developed capitalist countries, furthermore.

In the first decade of the 20th century ahead of all the exporters of capital was Britain, which was followed by France and then the United States, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Italy and Japan. By the end of the 1920's the United States had moved into first place, having superseded Britain (if military loans are excluded, however, Britain still retained first place), France was in third place and then came Holland, Switzerland and Germany.

In the latter half of the 1930's Britain again overtook the United States. In third place was the Netherlands and only then in fourth place came France; then followed Switzerland and Belgium. The fascist Axis powers--Germany, Japan and Italy--increased their investments abroad.

There was a new reshuffling of international investors in the latter half of the 1940's; the United States surged to the front, overtaking Britain. In third place was Canada, in fourth place Holland and now in fifth place France. Routed Germany, Italy and Japan lost the bulk of their overseas investments and were for a number of years "unseated" as rivals of the other exporters of capital.

* See V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 27, pp 359-360.

The latter half of the 1950's showed the following distribution--United States, Britain, France, Canada, Switzerland, the FRG, Belgium, Holland and Italy.

A decade later the United States had retained its hegemony in the sphere of the export of capital. Britain retained second place and France third and the FRG had moved into fourth place.

In the latter half of the 1970's the list of foreign investors continued to be headed by the United States and then came Britain, the FRG, Switzerland, Japan and Holland, France only in seventh place and then Canada, Sweden and so forth. Currently the positions of American capital are being squeezed by competitors, although in absolute amounts American capital abroad continues to grow rapidly. For example, direct American investments abroad from 1967 through 1981 increased by a factor of 4.5--from \$50.4 billion to \$227.3 billion. However, in relation to other Western countries their share declined somewhat--less than 50 percent in 1981.

The U.S. monopolies are attempting to compensate for this relative deterioration with the more active use of means of political pressure, military blackmail and the subordination of the competitors.

The United States' book market is inundated annually with numerous works of literature on economics, history, philosophy and foreign policy. A prominent place in them is assigned the problem of the United States' economic relations with other countries and the history of these relations.

The "studies" on this problem flagrantly distort facts and data concerning, for example, the relations between the United States and China in the 19th century. The expansionist policy of American capitalism in respect of China is portrayed as disinterested and as corresponding to the interests of the Chinese people.

The same should be said of the illustration of the history of the United States' relations with other Asian countries and also with Latin America and Africa. Instances of flagrant expansion and direct aggression on the part of the United States against a number of countries and territories in the past (the Philippines, Cuba, Mexico, the Hawaiian Islands and others) are portrayed as measures dictated by concern for the local population.

The "historic mission" of American capitalism is extolled in every way and a veil is drawn over its true aspirations in respect of other peoples and the methods of diktat and blackmail. For this same goal active use is now made, as is known, of a variety of fraudulent slogans--whether, for example, assurances of the J. Carter and R. Reagan administrations concerning their allegiance to the "defense of human rights" or the demands of the R. Reagan administration concerning a so-called "universal favorable investment climate."

All this is being done to "establish" a connection between the practice of American capital's penetration of the economy of other countries in the past and its extensive foreign economic expansion currently, both being portrayed in a false light.

It also has to be noted that the more directly the areas of the expansion of American capital are connected with the United States' foreign policy course, the more assiduous the attempts to conceal this connection. This is understandable inasmuch as the goal being pursued is that of deception of the peoples, including the American people, with regard to the true essence of the policy currently being pursued by U.S. leading circles.

The export of capital in the form of the loans, credit, "gifts," subsidies and so forth granted by the United States to various, predominantly developing, countries by way of economic, technical and military "assistance"--it has been exercised in recent years mainly along government lines--is portrayed as "assistance," whose purpose is an increase in these countries' "defense capability," although in actual fact no one is threatening them, if we disregard the threat of their enslavement by American capital.

The bulk of the resources channeled abroad by the United States in the form of economic and military "assistance," and, furthermore, the latter is showing a tendency toward appreciable expansion, is accounted for by a comparatively small number of countries. It is closely tied in with Washington's military-strategic goals, particularly in such areas as the Mediterranean, the Near and Middle East and South and Southeast Asia (see Table 4).

Table 4. The Biggest Indicators of American Economic and Military "Assistance" (1981, \$ millions)

| Country | Economic "Assistance" | Country | Military "Assistance" |
|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| Egypt | 1,189 | Israel | 1,400 |
| Israel | 785 | Egypt | 551 |
| India | 244 | Turkey | 252 |
| Turkey | 200 | Greece | 177 |
| Bangladesh | 155 | Spain | 126 |
| Indonesia | 128 | Philippines | 76 |
| Sudan | 105 | Portugal | 53 |
| Philippines | 92 | Thailand | 51 |

Source: U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT 26 October 1981, p 22.

It is also significant that simultaneously with the trend toward the growth of the expansionist aspirations of U.S. monopoly capital and its claims to domination over entire regions enforced acknowledgements of the limited opportunities for implementing such a policy are appearing increasingly often. A recent study by American authors entitled "The United States in the 1980's" acknowledges, for example, that in the pursuit of its expansionist policy, which the book calls "the exercise of responsible authority" (?!--A.G.) abroad, the United States has encountered "certain limitations". Noting that "foreign assistance does not in itself lead to the eradication of poverty" (the less so in that it does not pursue such a task!--A.G.) and that "modernization cannot be achieved rapidly," W. Campbell, director of the Hoover Institute, writes: "It has become a recognized fact that the United States cannot export democracy (?!--A.G.) to

the rest of the world" (?!--A.G.).* Since Vietnam, he continues, the limits of the United States' capacity for influencing events in the world in the direction which it desires have narrowed markedly. Pining for the times when the United States considered it had a right to demand obedience of all countries, the authors manifestly regret that the direct use of arms (as was the case in Vietnam) is also not producing for Washington the desired effect.

An analysis of the data pertaining to the United States' foreign economic expansion shows primarily that American monopoly capital basically was and remains the enemy of the independence and sovereignty of other countries and peoples, which it regards as an object of exploitation and plunder.

The reactionary essence of the export of capital is also manifested particularly graphically in the policy of monopoly capital aimed at eroding the unity of the world socialist community. A graphic example is its provocative policy in respect of Poland and the attempts to derive benefits for itself from the mistakes in economic and social policy which were made in this country in the past. It confirms that capitalism avails itself of any opportunity to secure its own class interests.

The deepening of the general crisis of capitalism is exacerbating more than ever the contradictions of modern capitalist production and the entire system of capitalism's international relations.

The particular anger of the defenders of imperialism is being aroused by the fact that part of American business, including its foreign affiliates, is seeking ways of cooperation with the socialist countries and expressing a readiness to establish and develop various forms of economic and scientific-technical relations with them.

The facts also indicate that the United States' West European partners have largely not fallen in with Washington's policy of economic and other "sanctions" against the Soviet Union. In addition, West Europe's business circles have repeatedly presented their own initiatives with respect to a further expansion of economic cooperation with the USSR. Even those who fell for the American "bait" were later forced to admit that the "sanctions" against the Soviet Union are not working.

The discriminatory policy of the present U.S. Administration aimed at undermining the economic cooperation of countries with different social systems is doomed to inevitable failure.**

* "The United States in the 1980's," ed. by P. Duignau, A. Rabuschko, Stanford (Calif.), 1980, p VII.

** It is indicative that the doomed nature of such "diplomacy" has been noted by, for example, M. Friedman, who is the acknowledged "spiritual father" of the economic platform of the present U.S. Administration. He has termed the economic "sanctions" against the USSR an "admission of impotence" (see NEWSWEEK 21 January 1980, p 48).

It is fitting to recall here V.I. Lenin's words apropos the development of Soviet Russia's cooperation with the West in the first years following the Great October Socialist Revolution. V.I. Lenin formulated the question thus: "Why are they acting against their will, against what the press is incessantly saying over and over.... They pronounce us criminals, but help us, nonetheless. And it transpires that they are economically linked with us."* And V.I. Lenin went on to draw a most important conclusion: "It transpires that... our calculation, made on the grand scale, is proving more correct than theirs.... We now see that economic development was considered by them wrongly, but by us correctly. A start has been made. We must now lend all attention, all efforts and all concerns to ensuring that this development not stop and that it go forward."**

Of course, present conditions are different from those of 60 years ago, although now also reaction is, as is known, ready to ascribe all its failures to the Soviet Union and its policy. However, the broad public and business circles of the developed capitalist countries, primarily of West Europe, now have a better idea of the possibilities and benefits of the development of relations with the USSR. They now have before them quite a sizable amount of accumulated experience.

"Since the first days of Soviet power our state," Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum, "has invariably expressed a readiness to open, honest cooperation with all countries which respond with reciprocity. Differences in social systems should not prevent this, and are not preventing this where there is good will on both sides."

The U.S. monopolies' expansionist aspirations were not destined to be realized in the past. They will not, of course, succeed in realizing such intentions in the future. The world is not moving according to the timetable of the U.S. monopolies and American big business and not according to the timetable of the figures in Washington who are at the helm of this country's foreign policy. The world is developing in accordance with the objective laws revealed by Marxist-Leninist science. The future belongs to socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

8850

CSO: 1816/5

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 44, p 303.

** Ibid., pp 303-304.

U.S. APPROACH TO DETENTE CONTRASTED WITH W. EUROPEAN, SOVIET APPROACH

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 82 pp 45-57

[Article by G. Vorontsov: "Europe: Washington's Intrigues and the Imperatives of Security"]

[Text] The sharp exacerbation of the international situation which occurred at the start of the 1980's through the fault of the most aggressive circles of imperialism, primarily American, has led to the threat of nuclear war, which had been put back by the successes of the detente of the 1970's, again having increased considerably now. The main question of the present day--that of war and peace--with whose solution the fate and very existence of our civilization and the primary right of each person--the right to life--are connected, is now on the agenda in all its seriousness.

It may be asserted with complete justification that international relations as a whole have now approached a clearly marked forking of the roads. On the one hand there is the path of the strengthening of peace and the development of peaceful cooperation on the basis of respect for the sovereignty, rights and interests of each state and noninterference in internal affairs. It is toward this prospect that the Final Act of the All-European Conference in Helsinki and many other documents of the 1970's are oriented. The fruitfulness of such a policy has also been confirmed by the entire practical experience of the European peoples. It is being championed consistently by the Soviet Union and the other community countries.

The path onto which mankind is persistently being pushed by the supporters of cold war and the most aggressive and militarist circles of the United States and NATO, which are endeavoring to cast aside the elementary legal and ethical standards of relations between states, cancel out their independence and sovereignty and recarve the political map of the world, leads in the opposite direction. It is these circles which in recent years have initiated a wide-ranging campaign against detente, adopted a policy of developing a new round of the arms race, primarily nuclear, and are attempting to throw out as being of no significance the treaty documents signed as the result of many years of difficult negotiations. An all-out "crusade" against the USSR, the socialist community and the national liberation movements has been proclaimed, attempts at economic blockade are being revived, tension is being spurred on and conflicts are being kindled in various parts of the world.

A special place in Washington's antidetente designs is assigned the European continent. It is this region, which at the end of the 1970's proved to be the center of the development of positive processes between East and West and which experienced most fully the salutary influence of detente, which the strategists over the ocean wish to turn into a proving ground of "limited" nuclear war and a zone of the deployment of the latest dangerous and destructive means of waging it.

I

Although distorted to the utmost, there is a logic in the fact that the latter-day "crusaders" from the banks of the Potomac have now selected precisely Europe as the target of special efforts to undermine detente. It is well known that the successes of detente in the sphere of the economic, political, cultural, scientific and other forms of the cooperation of states belonging to different social systems were manifested most markedly on the European continent. It was here that mutually profitable relations between the states of East and West were developed and that the numerous treaties and agreements forming the basis of these relations such as the four-party agreement on West Berlin, the Moscow treaty between the USSR and the FRG and many others, which exerted a positive influence on the European and international situation, were signed. The improvement in relations between the USSR and the United States which had occurred in the first half of the 1970's also contributed to the recuperation of the political climate, in Europe included.

The successful holding of the conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which culminated in the signing of the historic Final Act, may be considered the biggest achievement of detente. The conference was a result of a great deal of responsible and protracted activity with respect to strengthening peace and security in Europe. The convening and successful implementation of this forum were named as a central task in the Peace Program adopted by the 24th CPSU Congress. The Soviet Union made a tremendous contribution to the preparation of the conference and its work at all stages.

The historic significance of the conference, which has become a most notable landmark on the path of the strengthening of peace and security on our continent, is revealed in even greater relief from the standpoints of the present day. Finally disposing of World War II, the all-European forum consolidated the outstanding results of the victory over fascism. The document of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers observed that this "unprecedented meeting of the leading figures of 33 European states and the United States and Canada was an event of tremendous international significance. It initiated a new stage in the relaxation of tension and was an important step on the path of the consolidation of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the organization of relations of equal cooperation between states with different social systems."*

* "From Helsinki to Belgrade. The Soviet Union and Implementation of the Final Act of the All-European Conference," Moscow, 1977, p 15.

The results of the conference imbibed, as it were, the numerous and diverse changes for the better which had occurred in relations between European states at that time. The Final Act is with complete justification called a charter of peace and mutually profitable cooperation in Europe. The significance of the principles of mutual relations between states enshrined in this document is exceptionally great. These include respect for independence and sovereignty, territorial integrity, the inviolability of borders, renunciation of the use of force and the threat of force and noninterference in internal affairs.

Thus the conference on the one hand summed up, as it were, all that was positive that had been achieved by that time, reflecting the salutary changes which had occurred in relations between East and West. On the other, it created the prerequisites for the expansion and deepening of the all-European process and the consolidation of the security of all states of the continent.

The Soviet Union has stood and continues to stand firmly on the positions of unswerving fulfillment of all the decisions of the Helsinki conference. The principles of mutual relations between states should be observed particularly carefully--they form the core and fundamental part of the Final Act. At the same time the USSR proceeds from the need for the comprehensive implementation of all the provisions of this document without exception by all parties to it. Only then will the European peoples be guaranteed a peaceful future.

However, the events which have occurred since the Helsinki conference have shown that not all its participants have been disposed to observe the letter and spirit of the Final Act. More, as L.I. Brezhnev observed, certain circles in the West immediately began "to operate in the directly opposite direction."* This has been manifested in the disinformation and slander campaign against the Soviet Union and other socialist community countries and in the hysterical inflation of the "Soviet threat" myth.

The policy of aggressive militarist circles of the United States and its allies aimed at adding a further twist to the arms race spiral, undermining trust between the peoples of East and West, spurring tension and returning to this form or the other of the cold war is manifestly contrary to the commitments assumed in Helsinki. A certain strengthening of the influence of these circles in the latter half of the 1970's, particularly pronounced in the United States, has been reflected appreciably in the foreign policy of all the capitalist states, albeit to a different extent.

The trend toward a departure from the "code of detente" enshrined to the fullest extent in the provisions of the Final Act and also in other interstate documents of the start of the 1970's began to grow in the mid-1970's in the West, primarily in the United States. Relapses into the "from a position of strength" policy and thinking in cold war stereotypes began to appear increasingly often. The assumption of office in the United States and certain other capitalist countries of rightwing groupings of monopoly capital urged on the negative trends in the policy of the West and made them the basis of the corresponding states' foreign policy strategy.

* L.I. Brezhnev, "Lenin's Way. Speeches and Articles," vol 5, Moscow, 1976, p 418.

These features have been discerned in the greatest relief in the evolution of Washington's foreign policy course. Whereas at the start of the 1970's the United States not only evaluated the process of an easing of tension positively but also considered participation therein essential, President R. Reagan declared in a recent speech that "East-West relations in the era of detente in Europe brought disenchantment."*

Such metamorphoses of the policy of imperialism have a perfectly definite source and their own philosophical basis, so to speak, which is rooted in the specifics of the bourgeois thinking and world outlook itself.

The approach of imperialist circles to mutual relations with the socialist countries was determined throughout the past decade by and large by the "strength and negotiations" formula. The leaders of the Western states believed that an easing of tension and a strengthening of the military might of their countries and blocs were entirely compatible. These two components of the political course, which are contradictory in nature and, when detente is extended to the military sphere, mutually exclusive even, were regarded as parallel and inseparable components of the West's security. Pursuit of the policy of detente was thus attached to the growth of the West's military might, which is allegedly solely capable of guaranteeing "international stability". In addition, aggressive military-political alliances, primarily NATO, were even proclaimed an instrument of an easing of tension designed not only to provide for the "defense" of their participants but "detente" in relations with the socialist countries. Essentially this formulation of the question made the development of the detente process directly dependent on an increase in the imperialist states' military potential.

Such "logic," which was underpinned and directed by the assertiveness of the opponents of detente, which had increased markedly by the end of the 1970's, led in the latter half of the last decade to the NATO states taking under U.S. pressure a whole number of steps aimed at the development of an arms race of unprecedented proportions. Considerable impetus to this was imparted by the decisions of the NATO Council session held in May 1977 in London with the participation of the heads of state and government of the bloc's members. At the suggestion of U.S. President J. Carter it resolved to have drawn up by the spring of 1978 a so-called program of "long-term defense requirements for the 1980's," which was then adopted at the next NATO Council session in Washington in May 1978--at the very time when the UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session was beginning. The new militarist program provided for a whole number of measures aimed at a pronounced increase in the military potential and the increased combat readiness of the forces of the aggressive bloc and prescribed a 3-percent annual growth of military spending. Under strong U.S. pressure the NATO Council session in Brussels in December 1979 adopted a decision on the production and deployment in West European countries of new American intermediate-range nuclear missiles, although made it formally conditional on the need for negotiations with the Soviet Union on this question.

* "Department of State Bulletin," June 1982, p 34.

The hostile reaction of the most aggressive circles of U.S. imperialism to the increased political influence of real socialism, the growth of its economic and defense might, the approximate parity of states of the two systems in the military sphere which has evolved, the successes of the national liberation movement and the increased role of the developing countries in world politics have been underpinned in recent years by a further circumstance--the growing relative significance of West Europe and Japan in the capitalist system and, consequently, the relative weakening of the positions of the United States and the growth and aggravation of interimperialist conflicts.

Interpreting these changes in the categories of the "loss of American leadership" or the "threat" of such a loss, U.S. ruling circles have since the end of the 1970's, but particularly vigorously since the assumption of office by the R. Reagan administration, been combining efforts to undermine international detente with an offensive against the political and economic positions of their competitor-partners. The White House is deliberately emphasizing military-force means of solving contentious problems for the added reason that in this sphere the United States' leadership within the camp of imperialism has not yet been shaken, in the main. Washington is knowingly jeopardizing here the interests of its allies, primarily those of them which are interested in development of the detente process. Thus evaluating the "switch to a hard line" in U.S. foreign policy which has occurred since the assumption of office by the R. Reagan administration, the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT described it as a transition "to nationalism in relations with other states. Specifically this means less inclination to compromise on the part of the United States on the way to an agreement--whether at the trade negotiations with the allies or the arms control negotiations with Russia."* And the target of Washington's antidetente acts in recent years has invariably been Europe--in both its socialist and capitalist parts.

II

The aggressive trends in U.S. foreign policy have been most pronounced and have assumed particular proportions since January 1981. The R. Reagan administration has increased militarist preparations to an even greater extent than its predecessors. In October 1981 it unveiled a new, all-embracing plan of military-strategic measures. At the same time statements were heard from Washington on the possibility of a nuclear war and the United States' practical preparations for its "protracted" and "limited" versions and for the possibility of winning such a war. Preparations for the deployment of new American missiles in West Europe are under way at a stepped-up pace, the production of neutron weapons intended for it has begun and the achievement of any positive results in Vienna, Madrid and Geneva is being blocked. It is perfectly obvious that Europe has been chosen by Washington as the place most suitable for changing the strategic situation not only on a regional but also global scale, for achieving advantages for the United States and NATO over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact Organization and weakening the positions of socialism where they are strongest, that is, on the European continent.

* U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT 16 August 1982, p 21.

It is fitting to recall in this connection that the specific feature of Europe's international political position is that it is a continent through which the line of direct contact of the states of the two systems and their military-political alliances runs. Great economic and human potential is concentrated and powerful armed forces and armaments both of the West and of the East are neighbors here. The United States maintains an impressive troop grouping (approximately 336,000 men) equipped with the latest modern weapons, including nuclear (approximately 7,000 warheads) in West Europe. Weapons for four U.S. Army divisions are stored here. A large part of America's foreign military bases and facilities is located precisely in Europe and the adjacent areas. There are approximately 200 of them on FRG territory alone. The deployment in West Europe of new American cruise and intermediate-range ballistic missiles is designed to sharply increase U.S. strike power in West Europe.

Naturally, in the event of aggression against the Warsaw Pact states, such a situation would inevitably make the corresponding West European states the target of a retaliatory strike. After all, the American military bases are essentially not subject to local national control. That this conclusion is well-founded is also confirmed by Washington's present strategic goals, which provide for accelerated preparations for the unleashing of wars of varying scale and intensiveness, including preparations for a strategic nuclear war, and also the multi-optional use of nuclear weapons in such a war.

Particular emphasis in the United States' new military strategy is being put on so-called "limited" nuclear war. American Rear Adm (ret'd) G. LaRocque, director of the Defense Information Center, termed the most disturbing factor the spread in the United States of ideas that "it is possible to wage and win a limited nuclear war."* Such a war is envisaged primarily in Europe. President R. Reagan spoke about this directly in October 1981.

All arms of the United States' armed forces are preparing for war in Europe. The scale of the exercises of U.S. and NATO forces increases and expands from year to year, and the areas where they are conducted are growing closer to the USSR's borders. Thus the Autumn Forge maneuvers with the participation of more than 300,000 soldiers, 500 warships and 2,000 aircraft have been held since 1975 on the territory of vast West European areas and in the North Atlantic. They incorporate the practising of various versions of general and "limited" wars with the use of nuclear weapons against the Warsaw Pact countries. It is significant that the troop exercises are given an avowedly anti-Soviet thrust and variants of combat operations are run through in which NATO servicemen in Soviet military uniform operate on the side of an imaginary enemy.

In bringing matters to the point of a "nuclear exchange" in Europe and the conversion of the allies into "nuclear hostages" Washington is at the same time endeavoring in the event of a conflict to remove its own territory from a retaliatory strike. Of interest in this connection are the arguments of H. Kissinger, former U.S. secretary of state, that Washington has always attached

* THE DEFENSE MONITOR, No 6, 1980, p 2.

exceptional significance to questions of "maintaining complete control over the waging of nuclear war" and, correspondingly, the use of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons. As far as the West Europeans are concerned, their "secret dream," H. Kissinger observes, has been "first, of course, to prevent nuclear war and, second, should it nonetheless occur, act such that it avoid them," becoming a war waged by the strategic forces of the United States and the USSR.*

In fact for densely populated Europe a nuclear catastrophe of any level would entail incalculable disasters. Furthermore, as the report of the UN Secretary General "General and Complete Disarmament. Comprehensive Study on Nuclear Weapons" observes, any use of nuclear weapons in a so-called "limited theater of military operations" would inflict tremendous damage not only and not so much even on the sides' warring armed forces as on the civilian population. According to this document, the use of nuclear weapons in areas with great population density would entail--all other things being equal--losses among the civilian population 5-6 times greater than the losses among the personnel of the military units.**

The above evaluation is far from the only one made in recent years. Thus according to a report of the West German journal DIE STERN, the U.S. Army Manual provides under No FM 101-31 for a tactical nuclear war in Central Europe. In accordance with this, artillery and missiles will deliver tactical nuclear warheads to their targets over a distance of 15 to 110 kilometers. Even if they are exploded beyond the confines of big cities, approximately 10 million persons will die in the FRG.*** To this it should be added that many NATO experts understand the transparency of the hopes for some "limitations" of nuclear war. Thus the American general B. Rogers, the present NATO commander in Europe, believes that "any nuclear exchange will lead to rapid escalation to the level of general nuclear war."****

The different versions of "nuclear exchanges," which are being discussed in all seriousness by the American politicians and military, envisage this number of casualties or the other, and furthermore, figures of allegedly "acceptable" losses are often given. Such "exercises" are of a far from "academic" nature and are causing legitimate alarm in the broadest circles of the population of various countries, particularly in Europe.

The anxiety of the European and world public is perfectly understandable and completely justified. "American scenarios of limited war in the European theater by no means amuse us: after all, we live here," Prof E. Thompson, historian and writer and founder of the European nuclear disarmament movement, writes, "And it is here, of course, that we will die in the event of any nuclear exchange, however 'limited'."***** According to estimates given in a paper at

* See H. Kissinger, "For the Record. Selected Statements 1977-1980," Boston-Toronto, 1981, p 241.

** See "General and Complete Disarmament. Comprehensive Study on Nuclear Weapons. Report of the Secretary General. United Nations General Assembly," New York, 1980, p 69.

*** See DIE STERN 12 November 1981, p 95.

**** INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE 9 September 1981.

***** BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS January 1981, p 12.

the second international conference of Physicians of the World to Prevent Nuclear War held in April 1982 in Cambridge (Great Britain), in the event of a nuclear conflict on the continent, which some Western strategists portray as "limited," there could be more than 300 million casualties, that is, almost half of the European population. It would be practically impossible here for tens of millions of wounded to receive medical assistance, and those who survived would live under the threat of death.

It is necessary to dwell specially on the possible consequences of the use of neutron weapons, which the United States wishes to deploy in Europe. Their supporters, as is known, claim that they are "cleaner" and "more humane" than other means of mass destruction. The central part of the neutron weapon is essentially a nuclear fission bomb. As distinct from other types of nuclear weapon, energy in a nuclear bomb is distributed approximately thus: 20 percent is concentrated in the blast wave, while hard radiation accounts for 80 percent. A comparatively small amount of energy is contained in residual radiation. Thus on explosion the neutron device causes, just like all other types of nuclear weapon, radioactive contamination of the terrain. But it is not only and not so much even a question of this. While leading to the mass destruction of people the neutron weapon at the same time is designed to preserve physical assets from devastation and create more "favorable" conditions for the subsequent (following the nuclear explosion) use of conventional armed forces.

The use of neutron nuclear weapons in the densely populated areas of the European continent appears particularly dangerous. A few "low-yield" neutron shells would be sufficient to destroy everything living in a large city, while their mass use would lead to the total annihilation of the population. According to existing American concepts, neutron weapons could be used at any stage of an armed conflict, including at the very start thereof. In erasing the distinction between nonnuclear and nuclear combat operations they also erode the so-called nuclear threshold, thereby increasing the likelihood of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict and its escalation. Thus they could serve to detonate a general nuclear catastrophe.

Recently Washington has adopted a policy of extensively equipping the U.S. Army with chemical weapons. The 5-year (1982-1986) program of their modernization is put at \$10 billion, and, furthermore, Washington has already embarked on the production of new war gases-binary shells—which are designed to be the foundation of the arsenal of the United States' combat chemical weapons. To judge by the statements of U.S. officials and the utterances of Western specialists, the chemical rearmament is being undertaken by way of preparation for the waging of a large-scale war in Europe. The fitting of artillery shells, aerial bombs and cruise missiles with chemical warheads and their deployment at American bases in West Europe, primarily in Britain, the FRG and Italy, is envisaged. It is also planned to equip U.S. carriers in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean with chemical weapons.

We hardly need dwell in detail on the extraordinary danger of the use of chemical weapons, particularly in densely populated Europe. According to the calculations of Western experts, population losses upon the use of chemical weapons could exceed by a factor of 20-30 the losses among the servicemen participating in combat operations.

In evaluating the latest military plans of the United States it is impossible not to conclude that their implementation threatens Europe with a catastrophe of unprecedented proportions. "They wish to impress upon people that a nuclear war could be limited and wish to reconcile them to the idea of the permissibility of such a war," L.I. Brezhnev said from the tribune of the 26th CPSU Congress. "But this is outright deception of the peoples! For a 'limited,' in American concepts, nuclear war in Europe, say, would mean at the very outset the certain death of European civilization."

III

The policy adopted by Washington of confrontation and the undermining of the all-European cooperation of states with different social systems has been dictated exclusively by the egotistical interests of the United States' ruling circles. All-European cooperation is a natural process, which has evolved over many years and which is based on traditional economic, political, cultural, scientific and other relations between states of the continent. As the relatively prolonged cold war period testified, the atmosphere of confrontation on the European continent was of benefit to no state. Now, however, manifestly at variance with the interests of the European peoples, the present Washington leaders are endeavoring to destroy the fruit of detente created by the big efforts of all the European states.

There is growing understanding in West Europe that Washington's broadly publicized declarations conceal the egotistic interests and hegemonist ambitions of the United States itself and its endeavor to encroach on the interests of its allies and avail itself--in direct or indirect form--of their resources to achieve its own ends.

Of course, the class solidarity of the American and West European bourgeoisie ensures, as before, a certain degree of coordination in the approaches to the most important sociopolitical trends and phenomena of the present day. However, this community by no means rules out differences in specific evaluations and policies. Noteworthy in this connection are the results of a study of a working group of the Atlantic Council under the leadership of such well-known figures as K. Rush and B. Scowcroft. Analyzing the changes which have occurred in NATO, the authors of the report write: "Among the allies there are increasingly divergent appraisals of the threat (on the part of the USSR) and, what is more important, of how to respond to it. The United States is inclined to stress the importance of military strength; other members of the alliance emphasize political and economic methods of solving problems."*

It hardly needs to be said that the Pentagon's plans for turning Europe into an "experimental" field of nuclear war are encountering the growing disquiet of the broad masses of the population of the West European states, which are being condemned to the role of victims of that same "nuclear exchange" being discussed with such levity by American figures and strategists. Europe knows only too

* "Strengthening Deterrence. NATO and the Credibility of Western Defense in the 1980's. The Atlantic Council's Working Group on the Credibility of NATO Deterrence....," Cambridge (Mass.), 1981, p 9.

well what war is. Twice in the 20th century our continent has been the arena of devastating world wars, which brought death and suffering to millions of people. U.S. territory, however, has had neither military operations, bombings nor air-raid warnings even. Whereas the European states suffered tremendous damage, the United States profited in both world wars. Thus Great Britain's national debt in World War II almost tripled, and British exports declined to the same extent. At the end of the war France was producing 30 percent of its prewar industrial production level and its share of the capitalist states' exports constituted less than 1 percent. In contrast with this, at the end of the war the United States accounted for 60 percent of world industrial production and had 80 percent of the capitalist world's gold reserves. The European peoples have not forgotten this grievous historical experience.

It is clearly difficult under the evolved conditions to persuade West Europeans that the "missile decisions" adopted by NATO under U.S. pressure are designed to defend them. "You may deploy as many weapons in West Germany as you wish, but they would not be able to defend this country," the prominent West German scientist K.F. von Weizsaecker declared. "We can only be defended by political means, like the preservation of detente and the prevention of cold war."*

The broadest strata of the European public are now raising their voice against American policy. Peace marches, mass demonstrations and the collection of signatures to antiwar petitions have now embraced all the West European states. Characteristic features of the antiwar movement are its exceptionally big scale and the involvement of hundreds of thousands and millions of people. No less significance is attached to the fact that this movement unites a very broad political spectrum: from communists to religious figures and from representatives of bourgeois ruling circles to fighters for environmental protection. It is acquiring a permanent character and becoming a part of the day-to-day practice of each West European country.

To judge by everything, Washington has not only underestimated but failed to understand the essence of the movement and the extent of its influence. The very fact of its emergence and sudden increase has obviously been a surprise. The tags of neutralism and communist influence which were ascribed across the ocean to the mass antiwar movement in West Europe made a manifestly wrong evaluation of the essence of the movement itself and endeavored to portray it as some kind of "extremism" expressing the positions of only a limited number of groups. In actual fact the breadth of the movement, the involvement in it of entirely different strata of the population and its slogans reflect the fundamental interests of the West European peoples and their cherished wish for a peaceful future. These interests have recently been at variance with the goals of the U.S. ruling circles, which are ambitiously claiming the role of exponent of the interests of the entire West.

The sharp exacerbation of relations between the United States and West Europe which has been discerned recently is not fortuitous in this connection. A. Fontaine, the well-known French public affairs commentator and chief editor of LE MONDE, recently published in the American journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS an article under the characteristic title of "Transatlantic Doubts and Dreams". The article concludes that previously the disagreements which arose periodically between the United States and West Europe were attributed mainly to

* TIME 24 August 1981, p 9.

"misunderstanding". However, in the 1980's, Fontaine observes, such a growth of them has been observed as makes it possible to now speak of a "crisis of trust".* The American journal U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT cites a whole "catalogue of critical problems" on which Washington may not fully count "on the support of its allies." These are the policy of "sanctions" against Poland and the USSR, implementation of the plans to deploy intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe, U.S. policy in the Near East and the attitude toward the liberation movement in Central America.** Acute financial and trade conflicts may be added here.

The growth of Atlantic conflicts is complicating realization of the United States' antidetente goals in Europe. Compelling the allies to align themselves with Washington where and whenever it pleases has become an extremely difficult task for American diplomacy.

Endeavoring to block the West European states' aspiration to cooperation with their Eastern neighbors, the United States has been forced increasingly often to turn to tactics of open pressure, blackmail and arm-twisting with respect to "its closest allies and friends," as the NATO partners are called in official terminology. For the purpose of destroying all-European cooperation and trust Washington is even ready, as events show, to effect actions which are unprecedented in allied relations and which are usually taken in respect of "unfriendly" states. It is a question, inter alia, of sanctions against the West European companies supplying the USSR with equipment for the building of the Siberia-West Europe gas pipeline.

As is known, the White House adopted the unilateral decision to ban supplies to the USSR of equipment manufactured in West Europe under American license, hoping thereby to prevent West German, British, French, Italian and also Japanese companies from honoring the commitments adopted by them in accordance with concluded contracts. This decision caused a real explosion of anger in West Europe, showing clearly how great the conflicts between the "two halves" of the "Atlantic community" are.

The American decision was sharply criticized in the Old World. The Common Market called the U.S. interference in fulfillment of the deals concerning gas supplies intolerable. The leaders of West European states and also Japan declared that their countries would honor the contracts signed with the USSR in spite of the demands from across the ocean. More, Washington's unprecedented steps were evaluated by the world and European public as an unacceptable extension of American jurisdiction beyond the United States and interference in other states' internal affairs.

Even the United States' loyalest allies condemned the White House's decision. Addressing parliament, M. Thatcher, prime minister of Great Britain, declared: "The problem is whether one very powerful state may prevent the fulfillment of existing contracts. I consider such actions to be wrong."***

* FOREIGN AFFAIRS No 3, 1981, p 578.

** See U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT 18 January 1982, p 22.

*** THE NEW YORK TIMES 2 July 1982.

The sharp exacerbation of disagreements between the United States and West Europe in connection with the "deal of the century" has not only economic motives, although they undoubtedly perform a paramount role. Gas supplies from the USSR mean too much for the West European states in the present energy situation. At the same time the allies' staunch resistance to Washington's pressure shows that the West European capitals are beginning to realize increasingly clearly how great a danger the United States' adventurist plans could be to their economic and political interests and goals.

Washington is attempting without diplomatic ceremony to cut short its West European partners' aspiration to a strengthening of European security on the path of cooperation with the socialist community countries. Matters have reached the point of acts bordering on direct interference in internal affairs. It is thus that we may evaluate, inter alia, the participation of F. Ikle, U.S. undersecretary of defense, in the CSU congress in Munich in March 1982. Without beating about the bush, he demanded in his speech that the FRG strengthen Atlantic relations and warned "certain circles" of the country against the temptation, as he put it, "to hold nationalist positions between the two camps."*

The entire depth of the conflicts between the United States and West Europe has been revealed in the situation that has come about. The fundamental interests of the latter, economic, political, financial, military and others, are largely objectively at variance today with the policy and aspirations of the U.S. Administration. Political circles of the West European states are becoming increasingly aware of this. A survey from former FRG Chancellor H. Schmidt's office, which recently appeared in the journal DER SPIEGEL, testifies to their mood convincingly. The report says: "The United States should know that the alliance should comprehensively unite the different interests of the partners or, as a minimum, adopt a tolerant attitude toward such differences; and this applies, furthermore, to the FRG's special interests on the German question and also in the sphere of disarmament policy and economic and energy policy. The alliance is not an instrument in the hands of the United States."** Despite the clearly expressed loyalty with respect to Washington, Chancellor H. Kohl also believes that "it is not possible to behave in relations with another as one would not wish behavior in respect of oneself..."***

The growing distrust of Washington appears natural also. Summing up the changing attitude toward the United States in the West European capitals, the journal FORTUNE wrote that to the Europeans "the Americans appear as gangs of wild cowboys who are moving along a trail leading to an accidental or intentional armed conflict with the Russians."**** An eloquent confession.

IV

In their foreign policy the CPSU and the Soviet state have invariably proceeded

* SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 29 March 1982.

** DER SPIEGEL 17 May 1982, p 23.

*** INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE 6 October 1982.

**** FORTUNE 9 August 1982, p 38.

and continue to proceed from the fact that whereas Europe could be, as has been the case in the past, an area of particularly dangerous confrontations, it is at the same time also a region where far-reaching and promising achievements in the cause of detente, limitation of the arms race and the development of the equal and mutually profitable cooperation of the states of the two systems are possible in principle. The Soviet Union believes that the sole realistic path under the conditions that have come about is renunciation of the policy of force and confrontation, a return to constructive cooperation and the establishment of the principle of states' peaceful coexistence. This goal is realistic and it can be reached by relying on all the forces of peace and prudence on our planet.

As a counterweight to the policy of the use of force and the threat of force which has been made the basis of American foreign policy, the Soviet Union has put forward the foreign policy Peace Program for the 1980's. Soviet proposals on a strengthening of European security and the consolidation of mutually profitable cooperation among European states are an important element of this program.

The Soviet Union consistently advocates fulfillment of the Final Act of the All-European Conference and observance of the treaties and agreements which were concluded in the 1970's. The Soviet Union's line at the Madrid meeting and the Vienna negotiations is of a constructive nature.

The USSR has repeatedly proposed that the existing military alliances not be expanded and that new military blocs in Europe and on other continents not be created and also that the spheres of operation of NATO and the Warsaw Pact not be extended--on a mutual basis--to Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Soviet proposal that the participants in the All-European Conference undertake not to use either nuclear or conventional arms against each other is of fundamental importance. For the discussion and solution of questions of detente and disarmament in Europe the USSR and its allies consider the convening of an all-European conference advisable.

The Soviet Union advocates the strengthening of confidence-building measures in the military sphere. It has proposed an appreciable expansion of the zone of the application of such measures and expressed a readiness to extend them to the entire European part of the USSR on condition of a corresponding expansion of the zone of confidence-building measures on the part of the Western states also.

The problem of a reduction in nuclear arms in Europe merits particular attention, of course. In our time this is the key question in averting the growing threat of a world nuclear war. The Soviet Union is putting forward concrete and far-reaching proposals in this connection: from a threefold reduction in both sides' nuclear arsenals which exist in Europe and which are planned for Europe through the complete riddance of nuclear intermediate-range and tactical missiles from the continent. Aspiring to a sensible understanding on the principles of equality and equal security, the Soviet Union has proposed the establishment of a moratorium on the deployment in Europe of new intermediate-range nuclear missiles of the NATO countries and the USSR, that is, a quantitative and qualitative freeze on the existing level of such missiles, including the United States' forward-based nuclear missiles.

Endeavoring to facilitate the achievement of an agreement on a large-scale reduction in nuclear missiles in Europe and wishing to set a good example, the USSR resolved to unilaterally impose a moratorium on the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear arms in the European part of the USSR. Such arms which are already deployed here have been frozen quantitatively and qualitatively, and replacement of the old SS-4 and SS-5 missiles by the new SS-20's has been halted. This moratorium will be effective either until agreement is reached with the United States on a reduction in intermediate-range nuclear missiles intended for Europe or until the time when U.S. leaders, disregarding the security of the peoples, switch to practical preparation of the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe. If there is no new exacerbation of the international situation, the Soviet Union intends, as L.I. Brezhnev has stated, to reduce on its own initiative a certain number of its intermediate-range missiles this year.

While taking such constructive steps in a spirit of good will and demonstrating its love of peace the USSR at the same time warns that if the governments of the United States and the NATO countries still go ahead with their plan to deploy American missiles in Europe, a different strategic situation will have taken shape in the world. The emergence of a real additional threat to our country and its allies on the part of the United States would force us to adopt retaliatory measures which would put the other side, including the United States directly and its territory, in a similar position.

Wishing to contribute to the advancement of the negotiations with the United States in Geneva, the Soviet Union has unilaterally halted the further deployment of intermediate-range missiles in the European part of the country and is already cutting back a considerable number of these missiles. Refuting the assertions of certain Western circles, L.I. Brezhnev said with all certainty that no intermediate-range missiles will be additionally deployed where both the FRG and the other West European countries would be within their range. The decision adopted by the USSR on a unilateral freeze also provides for a halt to the preparations for the deployment of missiles, including a halt to the construction of launch pads for them.

The constructive, consistent and at the same time flexible position of the USSR on the questions of intermediate-range missiles convincingly demonstrates our country's love of peace and sincere wish to find a mutually acceptable agreement on reduction, on a just and reciprocal basis, of course.

The USSR's unilateral undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, which was expressed in the message of L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to the UN General Assembly Second Special Disarmament Session, was a step of exceptional importance. It is clear that if the other nuclear states follow this example, the likelihood of the outbreak of a nuclear war will be reduced to practically zero. The USSR also submitted for examination by the UN General Assembly Special Disarmament Session the memorandum "Averting the Growing Nuclear Threat and Curbing the Arms Race," which collate both the fundamental positions and the most important concrete proposals of our country on these questions.

The Soviet Union is firmly disposed toward the stabilization and further development of mutually profitable economic, trade, scientific-technical, cultural and other relations between the two parts of Europe, on an equal and mutually profitable basis, of course, and with strict observance of the provisions recorded in the Final Act of the Helsinki conference. Struggling consistently for a strengthening of security in Europe and the consolidation of mutually profitable cooperation within an all-European framework, the USSR and its allies are prepared to cooperate with the forces and circles in the West which support peace, disarmament and the development of exchange between peoples and states.

The policy of the further heating of the international atmosphere, adding a further twist to the arms race spiral and disrupting normal relations between states promises nothing good to any people and could bring all mankind many disasters. Such a policy cannot win the support of the peoples and has no future.

The process of international detente and the achievements and experience in this sphere have today become a historic gain of the peoples. As L.I. Brezhnev emphasized in his recent Baku speech, detente is for the Soviet Union "primarily the general sentiments of states and their leaders in favor not of military preparations and hostility toward other states but peaceful cooperation with them. It is normal intercourse between countries and between peoples, conscientious observance of the rules of international law, respect for each country's sovereignty and noninterference in one another's internal affairs. It is, finally, a constant endeavor through practical deeds to contribute to the curbing of the arms race which has overwhelmed the world and an endeavor to strengthen security on the basis of the gradual deepening of mutual trust on just and reciprocal principles."*

This path--both for Europe and all mankind--is not only the sole intelligent and just path. It is also realistic inasmuch as it is based on objective factors of contemporary world development.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

8850

CSO: 1816/5

* PRAVDA 27 September 1982.

NEW EDITION OF BOOK ON ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 82 pp 114-122

[O. Ul'rikh, V. Sheynis book review: "Economic and Social Problems of the Oriental Developing Countries"]

[Text] A large group of Soviet scholars has produced a new edition of a fundamental work devoted to the foreign East in the postwar period.* It is a multilevel, truly interdisciplinary study whose sphere of analysis incorporates the most important aspects of social development: the economy, social-class, political and ethno-national processes, the movement of public opinion and the changing position of Afro-Asian countries in world economics and politics. The six sections of the three-volume work consistently examine topical and largely unresolved scientific problems which are open to discussion and contain a wealth of information.

Particular mention should also be made of the as a whole balanced and realistic approach of the authors of the work to a description of the complex problems confronting the Orient of the present day--and also those which it sets mankind--and the complex paths of their solution. While justifiably concentrating attention on the "actual scale of the first serious successes achieved by a number of countries at the present stage of development" (III, p 361) and their "first serious victories" (I, p 6), the authors are not disposed to make light of the difficulties and contradictions on the development paths being followed by the oriental countries--capitalist and socialist.

I

The appearance of the first (then two-volume) edition of this work in 1974 was a notable phenomenon in scientific life and elicited a lively exchange of opinions. This enables us to concentrate attention here predominantly on what distinguishes the second edition of the book from the first and to continue the discussion on the questions which appear the most topical in the light of

* "Zarubezhnyy Vostok i sovremennost'. Osnovnyye problemy i tendentsii razvitiya stran zarubezhnogo Vostoka" [The Foreign East and the Present Day. Basic Problems and Development Trends of Countries of the Foreign East]. Chairman of the editorial board G.F. Kim. Vols 1-3, Moscow, 1980-1981. All further references contain an indication of the corresponding volume and page of the new edition.

development of recent years.

A principal distinguishing feature of the scientific concept of the previous edition was that the problems of the economic and social development of the contemporary Orient were examined primarily from the multistrukture angle. "We are faced with not capitalist and not socialist but transitional multistruktural states," was how the authors' position was formulated, and the specific features of the multistrukture were connected with its "stability" and at the same time with the existence of "large-scale (mass-type) 'chunks' of production relations different from one another" and not "small-scale remnants of production modes which have, as a whole, outlived their age" (1974, I, pp 24, 10).^{*} These characteristics of Afro-Asian multistrukture central to the first edition have been removed in the new edition.

The question arises: how do the authors see the economic basis (or, more broadly, the production mode) of the Asian and African developing countries at the current state? As is known, the viewpoint has been expressed in scientific periodicals that developing countries evolving along a capitalist path are at different (predominantly early) stages of the development of the capitalist production mode.^{**} There is also a skeptical evaluation of the possibilities of the capitalist structure becoming the predominant production mode in the majority of developing countries.^{***}

Had the authors of the monograph confined themselves to removing the said formulas, this might have been evaluated as an abandonment of the previous rigid position on this question and an indication of the open nature of a theoretical problem which still has to be solved, and we believe that this is precisely the case. More important, however, would appear to be the shifting of the accent from the general formulation of the question of multistrukture to an analysis of the social production taking shape, which incorporates two principal components--the plan and the market (I, section I, chapter XIII).

The task set in the introduction--ascertaining the "leading, structure-forming system" (I, p 9)--is correctly accomplished (although this is not formulated directly): none of the systems enumerated by the authors (see, for example, I, pp 26-27) can perform such a role independently. And although it is perhaps premature in the majority of developing countries to speak of the functioning of a "single reproduction complex" (I, p 9), it is undoubtedly gradually taking shape, and the state and private-capitalist setups in countries proceeding along a capitalist path are performing a system-forming role together.

A most important theoretical achievement of the previous edition was the thorough analysis of the symbiotic forms emerging at the intersection of state capitalism and the small-scale peasant economy, cooperation, the lowest forms of capital and so forth. The new edition takes an even more important step forward, outlining political economy approaches to an explanation of how this system

^{*} References to the previous edition also indicate the year of its publication--1974.

^{**} See A. Dinkevich, "The Formational Development of Society in the Young States" (AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 5, 1980, pp 26-31).

^{***} See L.I. Reysner, "Is Transition From a Structure to the Capitalist Production Mode Possible?" (AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 11, 1978, pp 29-32).

functions as a whole, how the market value and production price categories are formed and how elements of both indicative and directive planning are being introduced in the economy (I, pp 261-265). Although the content of the description of these two types of planning in the text does not seem to us entirely accurate, the position according to which elements of both types of planning are present in the economy of a multistructural society (as of state-monopoly capitalism also) would seem perfectly correct.

The need for planning (despite all its evident inefficiency, if we compare outlines with summary indicators, as is soundly shown in I, pp 234-258) is dictated by the entire set of socioeconomic conditions of the developing countries. The authors emphasize the objective need for a certain deformation of cost relations in favor of the lowest structures on the scale of the entire economy and barter relations within the framework of the state sector and stress the harm of the "unchecked operation of the price mechanism" (I, pp 270, 276). We have to agree with this, but only one factor of the disruption of the reproduction process in a mixed economy--the market--has been targeted here. Yet the authors themselves correctly emphasize the positive role of an intensification of market relations in general and competition in particular under the conditions of the transitional economy. It is even more important to note that the "squandering to no purpose" of any national values (I, p 272) could to no less an extent than competition be put down to ambitious, insufficiently effective regulation pursuing in many countries the selfish narrow-group goals of the upper strata exercising state power and controlling the public sector. The economic and social costs of "suppression" of the market "from above" could, as a number of chapters of the work shows, be very great.

We would like in this connection to draw attention to the serious contradiction of social development on the periphery of the nonsocialist world. Marxist experts invariably point to the national state as the central (and centralizing) element of the mechanism designed to direct progressive social development. The inception and growth of modern production forces are occurring to a considerable extent within the framework of the public sector; the state is nationalizing foreign property, embarking on the regulation of the activity of transnational corporations, implementing agrarian reforms and so forth. In addition, it becomes the guarantor of the physical survival of millions of people in many instances where neither the mechanisms of the traditional system and the production and the redistribution of products nor, even less, the centers of the market economy have been able to cope with this. This social function of state patronage (from the position of the redistribution of physical resources) competes to a certain extent not only with capitalist but also initial accumulation. To judge by everything, the state in the developing world will remain a principal internal driving force of socioeconomic development (and sometimes the sole force).

However, the activity of the state in the developing countries cannot be characterized straightforwardly. The experience of a number of countries in recent decades testifies that the unevenness, instability and various disproportions in economic development, which had grave economic and social consequences, were sometimes engendered not only by spontaneous-market but also incompetent and disruptive interference of the state in the economy. The forms of the combination of economics and politics in the developing countries

are distinctive. The effectiveness of state leadership is verified to a considerable extent by the functioning of the economic mechanism. But the feedback lines here are extremely extended and the pulses which they carry not only delay but frequently carry distorted information. Over a long period the state, as shown, for example, by the experience of Indonesia or certain other Asian and African countries, may disrupt the economy, not being aware of the need to adjust policy inasmuch as the "verification" is effected via the sociopolitical sphere, in which it has additional "survivability resources". It is for this reason that, as the Soviet expert N. Shmelev has correctly observed, "the contemporary role of the state in the economic progress of the developing countries imparts paramount significance to the question of the nature of state power, the procedure of the adoption of most important national economic decisions and the role of the democratic factor in the economic organization of society."*

Thus finding effective mechanisms of the democratic forces' control over society itself throughout the developing world, the restrictions on its "freedom" of action in countries developing in the channel of capitalism and implementation of the "socialization in practice" principle, which was formulated by V.I. Lenin, in the countries of a socialist orientation are, we believe, an open and burning problem.

One further important theoretical question arises in this connection--concerning the economic nature of the state sector and the social allegiance of the ruling elite. The authors' position on this question is synonymous: in a multistructural economy the state sector is nothing other than state capitalism (I, pp 27, 188), in countries of a socialist orientation included (I, pp 220, 278), and the ruling elite is a secondary social formation and merely "the agent of the ruling class directly exercising political power" (I, p 321). This viewpoint has been expressed repeatedly in our scientific literature and has engendered serious debate. In the new work the propositions contained in the first edition are reproduced unchanged, while the opinions defended in a number of scientific publications*** are ignored.

These opinions may be disputed, but they hardly deserve to be circumvented. Even less in that in an analysis of a number of concrete questions of the interaction of different economic structures in the transitional economy the authors rightly believe that "state capitalism" has been brought into being by the exigencies of "many local structures" (I, p 188) and that separation of the "principal and subordinate causes of state intervention in circulation" has been made more difficult and note "the changeability of state capitalism and its capacity for a wide amplitude of fluctuations" (I, p 200). Whether this amplitude fits into the "state capitalist" scale is obviously one further relevant question to be answered by Marxist experts.

* "The Developing Countries: Accumulation and Economic Growth," Moscow, 1977, p 110-111.

** See V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 36, p 171.

*** See, for example, "The Developing Countries: Characteristics, Trends, Prospects," Moscow, 1974, pp 177-193; "Economy of the Developing Countries: Theories and Methods of Study," Moscow, 1979, pp 324-351; and NORODY AZII I AFRIKI No 5, 1979, pp 180-208.

We would like in this connection to mention that the degree of relative independence of the groups exercising state power and personifying state ownership in respect of their other contracting parties is in many developing countries exceptionally great. The basis of this is a combination and mutual superposition of a number of features, including the weakness of local capital, the historical traditions of oriental despotism, which have been mentioned in Soviet literature, and the ruling groups' considerably greater autonomy with respect to all primary social formations of the "invertebrate" society* on the one hand and the antidemocratic, centralizing-bureaucratic urges inherent in the society of contemporary state-monopoly capitalism and transplanted into the developing world together with a variety of external influences on the other. But whereas in the developed capitalist countries the latter trend encounters the resistance of the democratic forces, primarily the working class, on the periphery of the nonsocialist world the state under conventional conditions is, as a rule, less susceptible to influence on the part of social classes and strata of the national society "outside of" and "below" the hierarchical power structure. Soviet scholars have also noted that the inadequate influence which the masses have exerted on the political situation has opened the way in a number of countries of a socialist orientation to an upper-stratum coup or a change in the policy of their leadership.**

II

The new edition of the collective work expands and highlights in a special section study of the agrarian-peasant question--a central problem of social development in the East. It is sufficient to say that from one-half to nine-tenths of the population is employed in agriculture and an impressive part of the gross domestic product is created and at the same time the most acute social problems are concentrated and a system of curiously interwoven pre-industrial forms of socioeconomic relations is maintained here. The authors have shown convincingly, in our opinion, that agrarian relations are on the one hand part of the entire system of the Afro-Asian countries' national social relations and, on the other, are experiencing the growing impact of the factors which are formed outside of this group of countries, primarily of scientific-technical progress. The breakup and modification of traditional relations in the countryside, the appearance of centers of the "green revolution" and the obstacles on its path and the revolutionization of the peasantry and the growth of its political activeness--all these and many other socioeconomic processes of agricultural development in the emergent countries predetermine the exceptional complexity and contradictoriness of the changes in social relationships occurring there. Accordingly, study of the agrarian-peasant issue inevitably assumes a multilevel nature.

* See "The Developing Countries: Characteristics, Trends, Prospects," p 198. It is interesting to note that K. Marx pointed to the proximity to oriental despotism of forms of Spanish absolutism (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 10, p 432). The latter, as is known, left a profound imprint on the statehood of many Latin American countries.

** See R. Ul'yanovskiy, "Countries of a Socialist Orientation" (KOMMUNIST No 11, 1979, p 120).

The monograph of Soviet orientalists makes an in-depth analysis of the conditions of reproduction in the agriculture of the Afro-Asian countries and a broad range of problems of the socioeconomic evolution of the countryside at the stage of its transition from the pre-industrial to the industrial stage: the acceleration of social stratification and the formation of an organized peasant movement. Examining the course of the "green revolution," the authors raise the cardinal question of the possibilities of the development of agrarian capitalism and its capacity for "digesting in full the entire social material within whose framework it is taking shape." They do not see such a prospect and draw a conclusion whose significance we would like to emphasize: "In its movement at the industrial stage agrarian capital not only intensifies its own, intrinsic contradictions (between labor and capital) but also spurs the contradictions which have been caused by the existence of the old forms of ownership and form the basis of the 'blind alley' branches of socioeconomic evolution" (II, p 102).

The second edition of the monograph has been enriched by new chapters devoted to the peasant movement (II, section III, chapters IV and V). The analysis of the concrete causes, manifestations and forms of social tension in the countryside of a number of oriental countries in the 1960's-1970's would appear extraordinarily important. In drawing attention to the deep-lying processes the authors have shown that, although following the implementation of antifeudal reforms the intensity of the peasant movement in a number of oriental countries has abated somewhat, social tension in the countryside remains and is increasing at times. This conclusion adds appreciable amplifications to the question of the further trends of the change in the social content of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the developing countries and the participation of different strata of the peasantry in the struggle of the progressive forces.

The particular conditions of the development of the peasant movement in the countries of a socialist orientation are illustrated in less detail (II, pp 178-184). Yet a most acute (frequently concealed) class struggle is developing in the countryside of these countries since the exploiter elements there preserve economic power and political influence to this extent or the other and are counteracting the policy of the state aimed at strengthening the small-scale peasant farms and liquidating landlessness and at the progressive formation of rural workers into cooperatives. The differentiation of the peasantry in the countries of a socialist orientation and its political consequences is an extraordinarily relevant and insufficiently studied problem which in our scientific literature is represented by a number of interesting single-country studies, but is still in need of serious theoretical collation.

The fate of the socioeconomic development of the oriental emergent countries and the development of the revolutionary process there largely depend on the growing concealed agrarian overpopulation, mass forms of partial unemployment in agriculture and the "demographic explosion," which has become a characteristic feature of the young states' social development. Unfortunately, the short chapter devoted to problems of the employment of the population (I, section I, Chapter III) is of a predominantly descriptive nature and does not lead the reader to generalizations and conclusions which are necessary for a complete picture. It would seem to us that the progressive growth of agrarian

overpopulation (to judge by national sources, in the last 10 years the population in the rural areas, despite the huge outflow to the cities, has increased by more than one-fourth) and the growth of unemployment there in various forms (it is currently put at 35-40 percent and more with respect to the gainfully employed population) are factors of paramount significance which will determine to a considerable extent the nature of economic and social development in the Orient in the next few decades.

Industrialization in many developing countries has until recently been interpreted almost exclusively as industrial development. In recent years, however, both scientific literature and official documents of the developing states and international organizations have been shifting the accents to agricultural progress thanks to industrial methods of production. Supporting this shift of accents in principle, we consider it advisable to sum up here the arguments in its defense. First, the agricultural product, primarily food, occupies an exceptionally important place in the hierarchy of the developing society's requirements. Second, world possibilities of the expansion of food production thanks to the developed countries are not unlimited; the limits to extensive-type growth, thanks to an expansion of the areas in the developing countries, are drawn even more sharply. Third, large-scale food imports are a main cause of exacerbation of the developing states' balance of payments problem, and agriculture is a sphere of the most acute need for import substitution. Fourth, the comparatively lower, as a rule, capital-intensiveness of agricultural production could lead to more rapid and perceptible results from the viewpoint of recovery of expenditure. Fifth, the emphasis on agriculture could ease the hotbed nature of the development of the emergent countries as a whole. Sixth, increased attention to social (and not only economic) development in the countryside could make a certain contribution to easing the problems of employment and hyperurbanization.

The lowering of agriculture's share of the gross domestic product and employment is one thing. This is a natural and irreversible process. A situation wherein agriculture is in a neglected state as a result of the fact that the creation of essential or, at times, merely prestigious facilities corresponding or not corresponding to the priority needs of this country or the other is paramount in development strategies is quite another. Agriculture is reduced to the position of a stepson of economic growth under conditions where the spontaneous movement of private capital usually—for this reason or the other—bypasses this sphere. Whatever the roots of such a policy, it does not correspond, in our view, to the fundamental interests of the economic development of the overwhelming majority of developing countries.

A merit of the work is the politically topical study of the role of the communist parties of a number of Afro-Asian countries in the struggle to surmount the lagging of the agrosphere and improve the position of the broad peasant masses, which constitute the majority of the population, and for the political stimulation of the rural workers. The development of this question on the basis of an analysis of a great deal of factual material is undoubtedly an impressive contribution to the study of the socioeconomic characteristics of the development of the foreign East at the current stage.

Nor can we fail to agree with the authors that the "national question was and remains a most important and complex phenomenon of man's social life" (II, p 187).

This is particularly right in respect of the contemporary oriental societies with their most intricate range of national situations.

Out of the tremendous range of problems related to the sphere of national relations taking shape in the multinational oriental states the authors have been able to select the main ones influencing particularly visibly the development of other social spheres. National relations, as the experts convincingly show, may exert both a positive and negative influence on the socioeconomic reorganization of traditional oriental societies. Nor is the influence of the political superstructure on the contradictory process of the development of these relations synonymous. An important merit of the special section of the monograph devoted to the national question is the fact that it correctly correlates that which is common to the totality of developing countries and that which is particular for groups of countries with similar development conditions.

The unevenness of the development and the differentiation of the Afro-Asian countries stood out considerably more sharply in the 1970's than before, and this subject naturally has been markedly developed in the new edition of the book. The authors' scientific positions on this question are largely close to us, and although the doubts they express concerning the fact that "general trends and characteristics" are present in the development of Asian, African and Latin American countries seem somewhat exaggerated--such trends and characteristics do exist, we believe--the objections to an absolutization of the "comprehensive" approach to these countries seem entirely justified (I, p 523).

With respect to socioeconomic criteria alone the authors propose three versions of a typology of the oriental countries which differ from one another (I, pp 12-13, 36, 524-538). This multiplicity of approaches within the framework of a single volume and, what is even more important, for the accomplishment of a single task--ascertaining the main types of socioeconomic development--does not appear to us to be the most rational solution of the question. Arguments both "for" and "against" each of these versions could be adduced.* Thus the unification in a single group of countries "which are reaching the initial positions for subsequent rapid economic development"--India, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand (I, p 525)--appears to a certain extent arbitrary.**

Typologically, the socioeconomic structure of Afro-Asian countries of a capitalist orientation appears somewhat different to us: the main bloc of countries which have the overwhelming part of the population (with essential differences within it, whose ascertainment demands a more differentiated approach); the group of less developed countries (basically, but not entirely coinciding with the well-known UN list); and two groups of countries with a

* See, for example, NARODY AZII I AFRIKI No 4, 1981, pp 194-201.

** The essential differences between them are determined primarily by the size of the economic potential and structural characteristics connected therewith. Furthermore, the Philippines and Thailand have already shown a high dynamism of development, but predicting the rate of development of India and Pakistan is evidently still risky, and the volume of tasks to be tackled by these heavily populated countries is immeasurably greater.

relatively small population which are distancing themselves increasingly from these "nuclei": the "wealthy" (but by no means all) oil-exporters and the countries which have attained the level and structure parameters of middle-development capitalism (or, at least, are approaching it).

The first of these two latter groups, whose characteristics are diverging increasingly from the "average-statistical" groups for the developing world, is given a special chapter in the new edition of the monograph (I, chapter VII) which is concise, but capacious in content and which reveals a number of aspects of the confrontation of the developed capitalist and oil-producing countries. The evolved situation is described quite convincingly, and the next step, evidently, should consist of a political economy interpretation of this unique phenomenon. The place of precapitalist socioeconomic structures (predominantly state) in the world capitalist economy and the nature of relations in the imperialist centers-"wealthy oil exporters-remaining developing countries triangle are changing also. A further set of open scientific problems is outlined here.

Recent events in Iran and also the Iran-Iraq war have shown not only the general political instability in a part of the world where the overwhelming proportion of states of this group is concentrated but also the profound instability of their economic development and the narrowness and vulnerability of the base on which it is being effected. Such "gaps" in economic growth, which could have long-term consequences, are possible in other oil-producing countries also. However, the acute political collisions may delay, but not cancel objective socioeconomic processes. We should not for this reason underestimate the possibilities possessed by the states of this group (the number of which in the next two-three decades will probably increase rather than decline). From this angle oil will evidently not lose its key significance in the world economy; it must be assumed that the correlation of prices for liquid fuel and other commodities established since 1973 will not return to the former level. Furthermore, certain oil-producing countries have become major exporters of capital; even now the income from this capital constitutes a highly impressive value.

The highly productive economic mechanism, whatever its genesis, structure and place in the national economy of the oil-exporting countries, began to function comparatively recently, but the effect of the high income will exert a growing influence on the economy. These countries' social structures will be reorganized in this way or the other. At the same time their aspiration to an independent policy expressing in concentrated form the interests of these states' ruling groups will inevitably strengthen. There is no reason to doubt that the role of the oil-exporting countries in world economics and politics will continue to be quite great.

We are possibly somewhat less optimistic than the authors of the monograph with respect to the hopes which erupted at the start of the 1970's that the developing countries which export other types of raw material would be able to repeat the successes of the oil exporters. Appreciably greater possibilities are being afforded, it would appear, countries of a different type. Their development and inclusion in the international division of labor is based on the creation of modern sectors of processing industry. This type of middle-development capitalism in the developing world (which already exists in Asian countries)

deserves considerably more thorough examination. The reorientation of foreign capital from the traditional to the new sectors also deserves more attentive analysis (I, section I, chapter VI).

The group of countries of middle-development capitalism is represented mainly by Latin American states. However, besides several small states and territories in the Near and Far East which have already attained the level of middle-development capitalism, a more or less similar type of socioeconomic development has been manifested relatively distinctly on the middle (in terms of development level) "floors" of the developing Orient also. It is a question of the preferential orientation toward the growth of a number of sectors of modern processing industry and the accelerated export of its products to the world market with all the consequences both for the internal socioeconomic structure of the corresponding countries and territories and for their place in the world economy ensuing therefrom. It would seem useful from this viewpoint to distinguish a particular group of Asian countries and territories which are at different levels of general economic development and united not by the "horizontal" but a kind of "vertical," at the summit of which are Singapore and Hong Kong, in the middle South Korea and Taiwan and at the foot as yet only the Philippines and Thailand, although other countries will also possibly be pulled into this line of development in time. This grouping, which cuts through today's "floors of development," possibly outlines an important future projection useful for a comprehension of likely shifts in the structure of the developing world.

III

Our scientific literature does not have that many summary works which examine in so detailed and comprehensive a manner the most varied aspects of social, cultural and ideological development as the monograph does. We would note here just some of the important features. Primarily the idea of the "exceptional stability of the traditions, structures and institutions of oriental society" (I, p 288) and the "national-psychological and cultural-traditional obstacles" in the way of economic development (I, p 62). The course of social development in the East in the 1970's showed how pertinent are the formulation and study of this question from Marxist standpoints and how relative, as the authors put it, is the "proposition of the direct influence of economic factors on the class struggle" (I, p 295).

The classical authors of Marxism repeatedly emphasized that production in the historical process is the determining feature only ultimately.* In the developing countries the chain along which the pulses emanating from the economy are directed toward the remaining spheres of social life is aligned differently than in the evolved bourgeois society. The deeper Marxist study of the problems of the contemporary East penetrates, the more obvious it becomes that these pulses, on encountering settled forms of mass consciousness and cultural stereotypes which have taken shape over centuries, frequently weaken, are distorted and call forth by no means the results which might have

* See K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 37, pp 394-395, 414-422; vol 39, pp 174-176.

been expected by relying exclusively on the historical experience of other societies. Among the factors here influencing various aspects of social development economic factors--particularly those taken in short historical segments--frequently prove to be not the strongest, and socio-cultural, religious and other features which are very remote from production could sometimes decisively influence the entire course of social (including economic) development.*

The Soviet orientalists' study leads right up (although this task is not formulated directly) to the need for an independent study of the problems of civilizations which differ among themselves in certain important culturological characteristics. The development of a typology of oriental civilizations and their comparative analysis and content description from historical-materialist standpoints (that is, connected with socioeconomic development, but not reduced only to this), based on concrete material, would seem to us a highly relevant task. Future researchers of this question will undoubtedly turn repeatedly to the analysis of the important aspects of sociocultural problems of the Orient contained in many of the chapters of the three-volume study.

Further, cultural problems are presented--and we see here yet another important field for further research--not only in the plane of the stability of the traditions of the "backward society but also in its reverse influence on the new political and social institutions and standards and relations which it is assimilating and which frequently in the course of such adaptation change beyond recognition" (I, p 289). The old not only resists the new but incorporates individual elements in the newly shaped, hybrid forms and makes them a source of strength and "survivability" for itself. Such phenomena are observed not only in the East, but here they appear in particularly naked forms, as is shown, for example, by the authors in connection with the analysis of the development of science (III, pp 266-267), the negative influence of Maoism on the ideology of the developing countries (III, chapter IV) and so forth.

In accordance with a tradition which has evolved in our scientific literature, the authors pay considerable attention to the role of the state in the East. As a whole, the analysis of this important problem is of a realistic and balanced nature. However, it is difficult for us to agree with some assertions with respect to this question. Thus the proposition concerning the "ever-growing need for state compulsion" (I, p 298) seems to use insufficiently substantiated in a scientific respect, while politically it fails to take account of a number of tragic experiments of "ever-growing compulsion" which modern oriental history has shown. The traditions of Asian despotism noted repeatedly by the classical authors of Marxism reveal a striking capacity for regeneration in the most unexpected forms.

* For more detail see "Global Problems of the Present Day," Moscow, 1981, pp 92-93.

We have already dwelt on the contradictory nature and consequences of the economic activity of the state in the developing countries. But the economy is by no means the sole sphere in which it is manifested. The reality of many developing countries shows that in regulating social connections and relations the state has endeavored to achieve in accelerated manner social integration and national consolidation. But in pursuing this basically progressive policy state power has frequently patronized some property, religious, ethnic and other groups close to it and encroached on others, and, furthermore, the underdevelopment of the social-class foundation frequently rendered such a policy inconsistent and inadequately linked with the proclaimed strategy of socioeconomic development. It defended political independence, which was achieved with difficulty, and made economic concessions to imperialism. The state suppressed separatist protests and opposed the forces of disintegration and very often endeavored to organize the political structure in authoritarian manner and replace with itself the as yet undeveloped (or not even conceived) civil society. It performed important work in many countries on the political education of the masses and endeavored to also control the ideological sphere, frequently implanting a monopoly of eclectic religious beliefs, the main purpose of which was more often than not the ideological-political mobilization of the population (individuals, groups, tribes, nations and so forth) for the achievement of goals more or less correctly reflecting national interests, but sometimes arbitrarily declared by the state itself and frequently established by "volitional" methods.

It should not be forgotten that the state in the developing countries is a creation of the social environment which it is attempting to modernize. For this reason it reproduces in its socioeconomic activity the views, goals, and value orientations of this environment. Expressing the national interests of all to a greater or lesser extent and representing in countries of a capitalist orientation the interests of the propertied classes and strata (local and sometimes foreign) to this extent or the other, it also operates in a class-antagonistic society with its own specific aspirations representing, in our view, a further particular interest--that of the ruling community itself expressing in concentrated form its social nature. Account should also be taken of the fact that groups which have established themselves in power in many developing countries possess opportunities which the exploiter classes and strata in the past lacked. These opportunities are afforded them by modern technology and organization--military, information and others.

IV

The authors of the three-volume work have made a multilevel analysis of international aspects of national liberation revolutions and examined the key contradictions in the emergent states' relations with the imperialist powers and the developing countries' increasing role in world economics and politics and the basic direction of their foreign policy, which has assumed the form of the nonaligned movement.

In the approach to an analysis of the world-economic relations of the emergent countries the question of the fact that these countries are experiencing "the active influence of the two world systems--socialist and capitalist"--and that, furthermore, "every national economy is integrated in the world capitalist and world economy to some extent or the other and, consequently, its development is closely interconnected with the regularities of international economic relations" is raised perfectly legitimately, in our view (III, p 296).

Great attention is paid to the Afro-Asian countries' fruitful relations with world socialism, which are introducing fundamentally new elements to the system of their participation in international economic relations.

Investigating the system of relations of world capitalism and the emergent countries, the authors conclude that "it is on the basis of the intricate interweaving of different manifestations of the foreign expansion of monopoly capital, which ensures important levers of control over the production capital of subdivision I, the structure of industrial consumption, the distribution of producer goods and international trade, that the mechanism of the extraction of neocolonialist superprofits functions" (III, p 316). They correctly emphasize that "the main material basis of neocolonialism" is foreign monopoly ownership in the developing countries (III, p 338) and from this standpoint evaluate the evolution of the emergent countries' participation in the international capitalist division of labor. The work thoroughly examines different aspects of the West's economic "assistance" to the developing countries (III, section VI, chapter IV). As in the previous edition, the differentiated analysis of the economic and social functions of "assistance" and the paradox of "the mechanism of the preservation of foreign economic relations which are not the optimum from the viewpoint of both sides continuing to operate in the world capitalist economy," which is shown convincingly by the authors, are of the greatest interest here (III, p 422).

The analysis of the position of the developing countries in the system of world economic relations leads the authors to the politically topical problem of economic independence. We would note that in this chapter they have amplified and developed their position compared with the first edition of the monograph. In revised form the achievement of economic independence is essentially connected with the surmounting of the dualistic structure of the economy and society (III, p 349).

We have to agree that the economic independence category is "historically specific" and that its universality "cannot be regarded as something beyond time and space" (III, p 349), that a most urgent economic task is "the utmost increase in the developing countries of the physical dimensions of the national economy" (I, p 279) and that for the accomplishment of this task it is vitally necessary to use the production potential of all (or almost all) the existing structures. In the hierarchy of objectively determined economic goals "high development" is advanced to first place. Does this mean that "in the modern era the 'economic independence' category unreservedly also means high development" (III, p 349)? While paying tribute to the original considerations expressed by the authors in connection with the analysis of this problem we would still wish to object to the identification of these concepts, as, equally, to the unduly sharp contrasting of economic dependence as such and "dependence on the international division of labor" (III, p 356), and also to raise a number of questions.

A high level of development is undoubtedly the firmest basis of independence. But "isolationism and autarky" are not, strictly speaking, the antipode of the "economic independence" category (III, p 349). The 1970's showed a sharp increase in Afro-Asian countries in aspirations which proceed under the "reliance on our own forces," "self-sufficiency," "collective self-sufficiency" and so forth slogans. Whatever the attitude toward the possibility of the solution of key problems of the developing countries on this path, it is on this path that many of them will probably attempt to ease their dependence on

disruptive outside influences. This is a reality which cannot be excluded from an analysis of the problem of independence.

On the threshold of the 1980's there was a sharp rise in the developing world in the savings norm, and expanded reproduction in the majority of them [sic] is being financed predominantly from internal savings.* For this reason in a concise, as the authors insist, definition of the terms of economic independence it is more expedient, evidently, to shift the accent from savings to other features taking account, as the work correctly emphasizes, of the fact that it is not "abstract economics" but "living social organisms" which are being compared (III, p 357).

The "country's social requirements" (whose satisfaction is a sign of economic independence) category which is present in the definition cannot be taken out of quotation marks as something which is self-evident, not to mention the dialectical nature of the requirements, which changes in the course of development. This is the subject of acute class struggle, and the requirements are understood differently by different socioeconomic forces in the developing countries and sometimes in a diametrically opposite manner.

Such, in our view, are the questions requiring further, more in-depth study. As a whole, however, the monograph undoubtedly provides a kind of synthesis of the scientific research conducted in Soviet oriental studies of the postwar period, raises new problems and is food for thought. We have attempted in this article to continue--touching only on the questions closest to us, naturally--the discussion which the authors of this multilevel work, which is extensive in the problems it embraces, conduct with the reader.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

8850

CSO: 1816/5

* According to our calculations, the savings norm in 1978 in the developing countries amounted to 25 percent and exceeded the indicator of the developed capitalist countries (21 percent). Over 80 percent of capital investments were financed from internal sources here (more than 90 percent in countries of middle-development capitalism).

BOOK CRITICIZING WESTERN VIEWS OF THIRD WORLD DEVELOPMENT REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 82 pp 127-129

[I. Aleshina book* review: "Problems of the Young States and the Groundlessness of Bourgeois Ideology"]

[Text] A new, so-called societal, direction represented by modernization theories was engendered in bourgeois social science comparatively recently--in the 1950's. Three decades--a comparatively short time--have proven sufficient for the passage of a whole logical cycle, on which Western social scientists have "closed the book" and themselves passed sentence on the state of affairs which took shape in the 1970's in this field of thought: "narrowness of approach," "lack of realism in an understanding of socioeconomic processes" and urgent need for a "serious renewal" of theories. The book in question is devoted to a study of the complex process of the "change of ideas" presently being experienced by Western sociology.

Analyzing the sum of the factors which have compelled bourgeois experts to draw such a disquieting conclusion, B. Starostin points primarily to the functional subordination of the theories to imperialism's foreign policy strategy and to their Occident-centrism. The point being that the "modernization" concept in their context is interpreted as a synonym of bringing the developing world "up to date" by way of the borrowing of "others'" values and its entry "into the cultural system of the industrial civilization of the West" (pp 21, 40).

Bourgeois specialists believe that a "renewal" of theories is possible on the paths of extending the boundaries of analysis and arriving at broad social problems. The author observes that this trend has strengthened to a certain extent under the influence of Marxism, in which a comprehensive approach in an interpretation of social processes is organically inherent; an aspiration to the integration of social knowledge in general sociology has been reflected also.

* B.S. Starostin, "Sotsial'noye obnoveniye: skhemy i real'nost' (Kriticheskiy analiz burzhuaizmskikh kontseptsii modernizatsii razvivayushchikhsya stran)" [Social Renewal: Outlines and Reality (Critical Analysis of Bourgeois Concepts of the Modernization of the Developing Countries)], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1981, p 183.

As the book shows, inheriting the traditions of the "fathers" of bourgeois sociological science, political economy, philosophy, history, anthropology and ethnography, the "societal" direction imbibed a broad range of problems from various disciplines and nonetheless proved theoretically and methodologically groundless in an explanation of the realities of the contemporary society of the young independent states. Despite the profound disappointment of the professionals and their intensive efforts to emerge from the blind alley, the said direction manifestly does not foresee the appearance of the "broad theory," as, equally, the global "development philosophy," to which it pretends.

The author analyzes consistently, step by step, the blocs from which the modernization concepts take shape. The work pays, and perfectly correctly, particularly great attention to a description of the methodological bases of the latter. B. Starostin begins and concludes his study with thoughts about the Western methodology of the "pluralism of factors," thereby emphasizing attention to its defects hurling bourgeois social science from one extreme of judgments to the other. The multiplicity of methods which are characteristic of this direction and which are very useful in concrete analysis do not compensate for the gap in its very basis--the lack of a general methodological base--which is an insurmountable barrier in the way of the creation of a genuinely comprehensive sociological theory.

The work examines in detail Western ideas concerning the object of modernization itself--the society which has taken shape in the developing countries. Until recently all bourgeois sociology was permeated by an approach in accordance with which two stages and two types of society--the "traditional" and the "industrial"--were distinguished in world history. The majority of Western experts interpreted the latter as the pinnacle of world civilization and the goal of the development of the emergent countries. Concrete interpretations of the "traditional society" changed in the theories--there was a shift from narrow-technological and normative approaches to the "socially pluralistic" approach--but the end result of development was invariably identified with capitalist society. As a result bourgeois scholars were unsuccessful in throwing light on the problem of the social essence and distinctiveness of the subject in question and in showing the boundaries separating the society of the past from the modern developing world and the latter from industrially developed capitalism. Nor was the question of the social differentiation of the emergent countries clarified.

B. Starostin rightly emphasizes that these problems cannot be solved on the path of the mechanistic formalism and anti-historical method of the "catch-up development" ideas. A scientific notion of the general and specific regularities of the development of the young independent states, just as, equally, of the very socioeconomic essence of a given type of society, is only possible on the basis of a formational understanding of the world historical process and Marxist teaching on the production mode.

An independent chapter of the work is devoted to the Western interpretation of the "social agents" of modernization--the performers of the functions of control of the multilevel process of social development. It is particularly interesting in its cogent analysis of the theories of leadership and elites and the formulation of the questions of the specific features of the social-class

structure in the developing society, the role of the personality factor and the singularities of the class nature of the modern state in the emergent countries. The relative monolithic nature of the "dominant ruling groups," which took shape on the basis of the ideology of nationalism, is in our day, as the author shows, being replaced by a trend toward a deepening of conflicts, which is intensifying as a result of the struggle for choice of social development path. "Further study of the ongoing social changes in their interconnection with the policy and nature of the ruling groupings," we read in the book, "would seem highly important for the elaboration of truly scientific and concrete models of the emergent countries' socioeconomic development" (p 136).

Western sociology is distinguished not only by a multiplicity of methods and variants of the object and subject of modernization; it is just as pluralistic in the question of the prescription for social renewal examined in the final chapter of the monograph. These include economic, technological, sociological and psychological approaches, which do not so much complement as are counterposed to one another. Until recently the "societal" direction was led by economists; it was they who attempted to answer the questions of the cause of socioeconomic backwardness and the ways and methods to overcome it. However, none of the above approaches provided a satisfactory answer inasmuch as the logic of the development of the Western countries was mechanically transferred to the young emergent states. B. Starostin accurately determined their defect: "The capitalist type of economic development was imposed on the 'postcolonial society' as if it possessed some 'genetic code' of capitalization" (p 147).

The capitalist path of development, toward which bourgeois theories are urging the developing countries, entails greivous social consequences--starvation, poverty and unemployment--and leaves "overboard" of society multimillion-strong masses of destitute. Modernization a la capitalism ends in tragedy for a significant proportion of the population of the developing states. Only on the paths of profound internal socioeconomic transformations and the reorganization of international economic relations is it possible to secure the conditions for genuine social renewal of former colonial and dependent countries.

Not all the sections of the book in question are of equal value in depth of analysis, and certain aspects of the theories have not been illustrated critically. Thus the colonialist "interdependence" concepts, which have been integrated in these theories recently and which distort their true essence, have practically disappeared from the author's line of sight. In providing a typology of Western modernization methods the author relies on unevenly applied criteria.

The shortcomings which have been noted in no way lessen the significance of the monograph. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that a critical outline of Western sociology of the developing countries in all its multiformity, including its ideological sources, has been presented for the first time in our literature. The reader has gained a trenchant study enriching him not only with knowledge of the current situation in bourgeois sociology but also an original Marxist formulation of certain problems, which the author counterposes to the scientifically unproductive and avowedly apologetic Western outlines.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

BOOK ON CAPITALIST ECONOMIC CRISIS REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 82 pp 133-135

[V. Shchetinin book* review: "Incurable Ailment of the Capitalist System"]

[Text] The problems of postwar crises and cycles occupy, as is known, a particular place among the questions being tackled by economic science. Interest in this subject does not abate, although hundreds of works have been devoted to it both in our country and abroad. And this is natural since many features of capitalism cannot be correctly understood without regard for the cyclical nature of the development of production within the framework of this social formation. The monograph in question examines three types of economic crisis: cyclical, intermediate and structural, that is, the main economic crises of capitalism.

The crisis processes of the 1970's raised anew many fundamental questions of the development of the world capitalist economy: probable production growth rates, new directions of structural shifts, the impact of structural crises on the capitalist world economy and the change in the overall model of economic development of the industrial capitalist and developing countries compared with the 1950's and 1960's. Study of all these questions is not only of theoretical but also practical significance from the viewpoint of the prospects of socialism's economic competition with capitalism and also the situation on the world raw material, fuel and food markets, where the Soviet Union is a major exporter or importer. Great significance is attached to the study of these problems in the decisions of the CPSU congresses, in the context of the tasks set the social sciences in general and political economy in particular by the 26th party congress included.

Among the achievements of the monograph we should put the multilevel nature of the investigation of an important subject and the single procedure of analysis applied to a lengthy period of economic development, which afforded the author

* A.I. Bel'chuk, "Ekonomicheskiye krizisy sovremennogo kapitalizma (tsiklicheskiye, promezhutochnyye i strukturnyye)" [Economic Crises of Modern Capitalism (Cyclical, Intermediate and Structural)], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1981, pp 328.

the opportunity of producing a number of independent and interesting results. Great attention is paid to theoretical issues, particularly contentious issues on which there are still disagreements among Marxist economists.

A. Bel'chuk's own contribution to the development of the problems of the crises and cycles is, we believe, primarily the proof of the need to delineate cyclical and intermediate crises. Emphatically criticizing the attempts to effect this delineation solely on the basis of differences in the dynamics of industrial production and capital accumulation, he at the same time provides his own definition of cyclical and intermediate crises and proposes a periodization of the postwar national and world economic cycles in the leading capitalist countries and in the capitalist system of the economy as a whole on the basis of a single approach to reproduction processes through a lengthy interval of time. Having analyzed the three postwar cycles (1948-1949-1957-1958; 1957-1958-1970-1971; 1969-1971-1974-1975), the author speaks of the extraordinarily motley picture of cyclical development, and, in particular, the conclusion of the obligatory or nonobligatory nature of a decline in production at the time of crisis phases is broached (p 162). He notes in this connection the absence of a decline in industrial production (in France, the FRG and Britain, for example) for over 6 months in the phases of the cycle which he defines as crisis phases. Examining the question of whether a sharp deceleration of the production growth rate may perform the function of a crisis of reproduction, the author concludes that an absolute decline in production in the overwhelming majority of cases is necessary for the upheavals of the capitalist economy to perform the functions of cyclical or intermediate crises of reproduction.

The definition of the essence of capital accumulation as the material basis of a cycle and the idea put forward by A. Bel'chuk of the dual function of capital accumulation in capitalist reproduction also merit attention. Taking as a basis the interpretation of the role of capital accumulation in a cycle which he proposes, he criticizes the viewpoint in accordance with which the period of the circulation of fixed capital determines the length of the industrial cycle.

The monograph assigns a large place to an analysis of the essence of structural crisis. Defining the specifics of the latter, the author observes that as distinct from cyclical crises, which embrace the entire economy as a whole, structural crises affect only part of it and some important sector or group of homogeneous sectors. He believes that structural crisis "is the creation of a fundamental disproportionality between production and consumption and supply and demand and/or a protracted disruption of the mechanism of the functioning of the evolved relations between the suppliers of a product and its consumers, is frequently accompanied by pronounced changes in price proportions and extends to the domestic economy and, as a rule, the world economic relations of the capitalist countries" (pp 212-213). The book cogently substantiates the expediency of delimiting structural crises in material reproduction from other crises (currency-finance and ecological and a crisis of the system of state-monopoly regulation).

Dwelling on capitalism's raw material problem as a structural crisis of the 1970's, A. Bel'chuk analyzes the economic aspects of the consolidation of the sovereignty of the young states over their natural resources. "The measures to limit the domination of foreign capital in the developing countries mean in their economic essence," the book says, "an expansion of the state's opportunities for appropriating differential and absolute rent, which hitherto was, for the most part, appropriated by the monopolies of the industrial capitalist powers" (p 257).

He concludes that the consolidation of sovereignty over resources in a trend will contribute to a change in the price proportions in international trade in favor of the raw material producers and exporters. Attention is drawn here to the fact that theoretical developments are closely linked by the author with concrete instances of the developing countries' defense of their sovereignty, in the context of the struggle for a new international economic order included (pp 248-251). The monograph puts forward the idea of the existence of a particular raw material cycle in the production and sale of mineral raw material on the world capitalist market in connection with the singularities of the investment cycle in these sectors of the economy (p 267-268). This idea would appear fruitful for enriching the methods of analysis of conditions in the world capitalist economy.

Of the other structural crises in capitalist reproduction in the 1970's, the author also dwells specially on the energy and food crises. He expresses the interesting thought that the 1979-1980 events in the energy sphere could be regarded as the start of a new stage of the energy crisis. On the basis of an analysis of this stage the work draws the conclusion of the probable influence of energy and raw material crises on capitalist reproduction, the economic growth rate and structural shifts in the 1980's.

The monograph in question is not, in our view, without certain shortcomings. This applies primarily to the question of the impact of crisis processes of a different nature on capitalist foreign trade. The interdependence of cyclical development and the dynamics of foreign trade remained unresearched to the extent merited by this important aspect of capitalist reproduction and world economic relations. The question of price movements in the capitalist countries and on world markets, which underwent such considerable changes in the 1970's, is in need of a more thorough analysis. The author says that the combination of recession and inflation has altered the mechanism of cyclical fluctuations to a considerable extent, but he does not analyze this new mechanism itself and the modification of the cycle connected with it. The work studies only individual aspects of the "price revolution" which occurred on world markets in the 1970's. These problems deserve greater attention, in our view.

A number of the author's propositions are insufficiently corroborated by an analysis of concrete factual material. Among these, *inter alia*, is his idea of the existence of particularly lengthy cycles in the sectors of extractive industry, which, he believes, are engendered by the specifics of investment cycles in the mineral raw material sphere.

A critique of non-Marxist theories of crises and cycles also occupies too modest a place in the study. It is provided with respect to certain of the problems analyzed (during the examination of the theory of growth cycles, global problems, the influence of Keynesianism on the practice of state regulation in the capitalist countries and so forth, for example), but is not set out in systematized form. Such a work should evidently have highlighted a special section devoted to a critique of non-Marxist (primarily bourgeois) concepts of crises and cycles, considering the importance of this direction in the ideological struggle.

Not all the ideas advanced in the monograph are indisputable, but there is no doubt about the author's endeavor to adopt a creative approach to the solution of important theoretical problems of political economy and international economic relations.

The reader has gained an interesting, trenchant book which will take its place among the studies of topical problems of the economy of modern capitalism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

8850

CSO: 1816/5

BOOK ON CAPITALIST RETAIL TRADE REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 82 pp 138-139

[R. Entov book* review: "Contradictions in the Sphere of Capitalist Circulation"]

[Text] In the situation of increased difficulties in the development of the capitalist economy and, in particular, the exacerbation of the problem of sales which was revealed throughout the last decade there is particular interest in an analysis of the contradictions in the sphere of circulation. The book in question is devoted to this problem.

Taking the results of her previous research as a basis, the author examines a number of important new phenomena which came to play a particularly appreciable part in the 1970's. The work shows that whereas throughout the 1960's the "end product" of trade was increasing more slowly than, say, the volume of industrial production in the majority of capitalist countries, in the subsequent period the deceleration of the economic growth rate determined the reverse correlation between the changes in the said spheres of activity; trade expansion in terms of rate began to overtake the processes of the increase in industrial production. The functioning of commercial capital is interweaving increasingly closely with the movement of loan capital. Thus on the American raw material and equipment markets approximately 95 percent of all sales now simultaneously presupposes credit transactions, and in retail trade the proportion of deals based on the attraction of credit resources or deferred payments has risen to 60 percent. The spread of check circulation and the active introduction of credit cards in settlements has expanded the sphere of the commercial banks' servicing of commercial transactions. The current accounting systems linking retail trade units with the wholesale centers are increasingly often using computers, which have been installed in the credit institutions conducting their accounts. The processes of the merging of the capital of the major trading corporations with the capital of the banking and industrial monopolies is thereby receiving additional impetus.

* S.M. Zagladina, "Kapitalisticheskaya trgoviya segodnya" [Capitalist Trade Today], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Mysl'," 1981, p 238.

The book's analysis of the singularities of the functioning of the market mechanism within the framework of highly developed state-monopoly capitalism is of theoretical interest. The monopoly associations, which dictate the "rules of behavior" of market agents, are the main participants in commercial transactions today; under these conditions the prices of the products of the major corporations ensure for the latter, as a rule, additional profit. The monopoly methods of competitive struggle condemn the economy to a gigantic waste of social labor; in accordance with the data adduced in the monograph (p 98), overhead with respect to the market sale of commodities (including the producer-companies' marketing costs) in the United States today is in excess of one-half of the total price of goods and services.

Under current conditions retail trade is an important factor of the ruling classes' sociopolitical impact on the people's consciousness and behavior stereotypes. Together with the industrial monopolies the trading companies are invading the personal consumption sphere, influencing many parameters of its development. The mass media complex, which is used by commercial capital, is playing an increasingly active part in propaganda of the bourgeois symbols of personal success and consumer comfort.

An analysis of the essence of marketing concepts is assigned a special section in the book. S. Zagladina regards the latter as a natural product of monopoly competition under the conditions of the acceleration of scientific-technical progress and the sharp exacerbation of the problem of sales. In the current situation monopoly firms are spending large sums to secure for their goods comparatively stronger market positions. Thus in periods of the preparation of mass production and sale advertising expenditure alone could amount to 40 percent of anticipated proceeds from sales. The author reveals the close connection between the high concentration of production and capital and the allocation of huge resources for measures ensuring the major corporations' product's "movement" to the market.

Bourgeois-apologetic theories have always put among the principal merits of the capitalist economy the customer being given complete "freedom of market choice". The book in question shows convincingly how narrow today are the limits of the customer's notorious freedom of choice. The major industrial and trading organizations are influencing increasingly actively the formation of consumer habits and tastes, controlling the change of fashion and artificially manipulating customers' behavior. In a number of instances it should be a question rather not of the possibility of choice but of the imposition on the customer of the products of the most powerful firms. The problem of intelligent choice is made even more complex by the practice of monopoly product differentiation, which engenders a multitude of versions of one and the same commodity. Thus the work adduces (pp 214-215) expert evaluations of American dental experts, according to which there are no appreciable differences in quality among 44 commercial brands of toothpaste in 33 different-sized tubes, it all amounting merely to differences in the name of the toothpaste or its packaging.

In studying the most important forms of monopoly practice and their manifestation in trade the author reveals the antagonistic nature of the interaction of the basic principles of modern capitalism--monopoly and competition. The analysis

of different forms of this interaction contains a number of interesting and at times debatable propositions. It is difficult, for example, to agree unreservedly with the formulation according to which under modern conditions the market "not only does not influence production processes in a major corporation directly but is a target for deliberate manipulation on its part" (p 96); this approach, we believe, shifts the accents in a description of the complex, intrinsically contradictory mechanism of monopoly regulation.

I would like to highlight particularly the author's extraordinarily fruitful aspiration to a comprehensive study of modern capitalist trade. She skillfully combines a study of the complex problems of the political economy of capitalism with a concrete investigation of a number of practically important technical-economic aspects of the development of American trade. The monograph contains many striking examples showing how the growth of economic difficulties is leaving an increasingly distinctive imprint on the functioning of the sphere of commodity circulation in the capitalist countries.

The material adduced in S. Zagladina's new work and the basic conclusions formulated in it will undoubtedly be of interest to the readers and, it may be hoped, will pave the way to further in-depth study of the sphere of capitalist commodity production and circulation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

8850

CSO: 1816/5

INDEX OF MATERIAL PUBLISHED IN 'MEMO' IN 1982

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 12,
Dec 82 pp 148-157

| | |
|---|----|
| [Text] To the Shining Memory of That True Continuer of Lenin's Great Cause, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev | 11 |
| CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers Appeal to the Communist Party and the Soviet People | 11 |
| Information report on CPSU Central Committee plenum | 11 |
| Speech of Comrade Yu.V. Andropov | 11 |
| Speech of Comrade K.U. Chernenko | 11 |
| Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov | 11 |
| In memory of Academician N.N. Inozemtsev | 9 |
| Topical Problems of World Development and Marxist-Leninist Theory | |
| "Lenin on the Great October Socialist Revolution" | 11 |
| "60 Years of the USSR: Along the Path of Socialism, Peace and Internationalism" | 12 |
| "Beacon of Revolutionary Thought and Action" | 5 |
| "With Confident Tread Along the Path of Peace and Creation" | 2 |
| "Real Socialism and Concern for the Good of the People" | 9 |
| "High Responsibility for the Fate of Peace" | 1 |
| "Policy of Prudence and Peace" | 7 |
| V. Zagladin, "The Great October and the Two Directions in World Politics" | 11 |
| S. Tikhvinskiy, "Lenin, Genoa and Contemporaneity" | 4 |
| "The Socialist Community on the Paths of Creativity and Progress" | 10 |
| K. Luft, Ye. Stepanova, "Socialist Economic Integration and its Bourgeois Critics" | 4 |
| B. Panov, "A Life Devoted to struggle" | 6 |
| E. Kuz'min, "The USSR Constitution and its Bourgeois Falsifiers" | 10 |
| E. Bagramov, "Experience of World-Historic Significance" | 7 |
| A. Shlepakov, "The National Question in the Capitalist World: Old Problems and New Realities" | 12 |
| The 1980-1981 World Economic Crisis (at the USSR Academy of sciences' Institute of World Economics and International Relations' Academic Council) | 6 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Structural Shifts in the Economy of Capitalist Countries (at the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of World Economics and International Relations' Academic Council) | 8 |
| The Capitalist Economy in 1981 | 3 |
| New Processes in Bourgeois Political Economy (Critical Analysis) (MEMO Roundtable) | 2 |
| A. A. Gromyko, "The Expansion of Capital and the Current Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism" | 12 |
| Yu. Rakhmaninov, "Europe at a Crucial Frontier" | 8 |
| G. Vorontsov, "Europe: Washington's Intrigues and the Imperatives of Security" | 12 |
| V. Petrovskiy, "Lenin's Concept of Disarmament in Action" | 10 |
| V. Petrovskiy, "Disarmament and the Groundlessness of the Contrivances of its Opponents" | 6 |
| At the UN General Assembly Second Special Disarmament Session | 8 |
| Yu. Tomilin, "Saving Mankind From the Threat of War--Duty of the United Nations" | 1 |
| S. Tsukanov, A. Mironishchenko, "The United Nations and Scientific-Technical Cooperation: Organizational Aspects" | 5 |
| S. Stashevskiy, G. Stakh, "Space Must be Peaceful" | 2 |
| Ye. Primakov, "The Place of the Emergent Countries in the World Economy" | 3 |
| Ye. Primakov, "The Emergent Countries in International Relations" | 5 |
| G. Kim, "The Soviet Union and the National Liberation Movement" | 9 |
| I. Timofeyev, "The Role of Islam in the Sociopolitical Life of Foreign Oriental Countries" | 5 |
| A. Astaf'yev, A. Nikonov, "U.S. Militarism--Threat to Peace" | 3 |
| V. Laptev, "The 'China Factor' in the Policy of American Imperialism" | 1 |
| Ye. Tarabrin, "Africa in Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 2 |
| A. Glinkin, P. Yakovlev, "Latin America in Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 10 |
| I. Vanin, "Imperialist Policy on the Oceans" | 3 |
| L. Lyubimov, I. Gorev, "The Oceans: New Legal Procedure in the Interests of Peace and Cooperation" | 9 |
| D. Smyslov, "Singularities of Interimperialist Conflicts at the Current Stage" | 7 |
| P. Khvoynik, "Complex Problems of Trade and Development" | 5 |
| Yu. Yudanov, "Current Trends and Forms of the Internationalization of Production and Capital" | 1 |
| Material to Assist Those Studying in the Party-Political Education System | |
| "Lenin on the Great October Socialist Revolution" | 11 |
| "60 Years of the USSR: Along the Path of Socialism, Peace and Internationalism" | 12 |
| "Beacon of Revolutionary Thought and Action" | 5 |
| "High Responsibility for the Fate of Peace" | 1 |
| "Real Socialism and Concern for the Good of the People" | 9 |
| "The Socialist Community on the Paths of Creativity and Progress" | 10 |
| V. Zagladin, "The Great October and the Two Directions in World Politics" | 11 |

| | |
|--|----|
| K. Luft, Ye. Stepanova, "Socialist Economic Integration and its Bourgeois Critics" | 4 |
| E. Kuz'min, "The USSR Constitution and its Bourgeois Falsifiers" | 10 |
| A.A. Gromyko, "The Expansion of Capital and the Current Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism" | 12 |
| S. Tikhvinskiy, "Lenin, Genoa and Contemporaneity" | 4 |
| A. Shlepakov, "The National Question in the Capitalist World: Old Problems and New Realities" | 12 |
| V. Petrovskiy, "Lenin's Concept of Disarmament in Action" | 10 |
| Ye. Primakov, "The Place of the Emergent Countries in the World Economy" | 3 |
| Ye. Primakov, "The Emergent Countries in International Relations" | 5 |
| A. Svetlov, "New Stage in the Nuclear Arms Race" | 11 |
| Ye. Tarabrin, "Africa in Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 2 |
| A. Glinkin, P. Yakovlev, "Latin America in Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 10 |
| R. Borisov, "The Near East and American Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 11 |
| Yu. Tomilin, "Saving Mankind From the Threat of War--Duty of the United Nations" | 1 |
| A. Astaf'yev, A. Nikonov, "U.S. Militarism--Threat to Peace" | 3 |
| V. Linnik, "United States: Imperial Ambitions and Reality" | 10 |
| R. Aliyev, "Japan: Trends Toward Militarization" | 4 |
| Yu. Yudanov, "Current Trends and Forms of the Internationalization of Production and Capital" | 1 |
| The 1980-1981 World Economic Crisis | 5 |
| The Capitalist Economy in 1981 | 3 |
| Real Socialism and World Development | |
| "60 Years of the USSR: Along the Path of Socialism, Peace and Internationalism" | 12 |
| "The Socialist Community on the Paths of Creativity and Progress" | 10 |
| "With Confident Tread Along the Path of Peace and Creation" | 2 |
| "Real Socialism and Concern for the Good of the People" | 9 |
| "Policy of Prudence and Peace" | 7 |
| V. Zagladin, "The Great October and the Two Directions in World Politics" | 11 |
| S. Tikhvinskiy, "Lenin, Genoa and Contemporaneity" | 4 |
| G. Kim, "The Soviet Union and the National Liberation Movement" | 9 |
| E. Bagramov, "Experience of World-Historic Significance" | 7 |
| K. Luft, Ye. Stepanova, "Socialist Economic Integration and its Bourgeois Critics" | 4 |
| B. Panov, "A Life Devoted to Struggle" | 6 |
| Scholars of the Socialist Countries on European Security and Cooperation | 1 |
| Economics of Capitalism | |
| General Problems | |
| S. Nikitin, "Inflation and Monetarism" | 8 |

| | |
|--|--------|
| Yu. Yudanov, "Current Trends and Forms of the Internationalization of Production and Capital" | 1 |
| The 1980-1981 World Economic Crisis (at the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of World Economics and International Relations' Academic Council) | 5 |
| The 1980-1982 World Economic Crisis (at the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of World Economics and International Relations' Academic Council) | 6 |
| The Capitalist Economy in 1981 | 3 |
| Structural Shifts in the Economy of the Capitalist Countries (at the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of World Economics and International Relations) | 8 |
| A. A. Gromyko, "The Expansion of Capital and the Current Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism" | 12 |
| G. Kumanin, "Structural Crises in the Capitalist Economy: Certain Contentious Issues" | 9 |
| L. Gromov, Ye. Chetyrkin, "The Question of the Inflationary Role of the Oil Price Increase" | 12 |
| P. Khvoynik, "Complex Problems of Trade and Development" | 5 |
| A. Poletayev, "The Profit Norm and the Postwar Economic Cycle" | 11 |
| P. Zav'yalov, "The International Cooperation of Capitalist Production and its Contradictions" | 12 |
| A. Tkachenko, "Monopoly Capital's Relations With Small and Medium-Scale Business" | 8 |
| A. Vlasov, "International Commodity Agreements" (We Answer Readers' Questions) | 11 |
| The Capitalist and Developing Countries' Oil Trade | 10 |
| Symposium on the Problems of World Economic Relations | 1 |
| John Kenneth Galbraith, "Conservative Offensive" | 5 |
| Unemployment in the Capitalist Countries (Statistics) | 12 |
| Interimperialist Conflicts | |
| Problems of West European Integration (MEMO Roundtable) | 11, 12 |
| D. Smyslov, "Singularities of Interimperialist Conflicts at the Current Stage" | 7 |
| G. Prokhorova, "Quest for a General Strategy and Interimperialist Conflicts" | 9 |
| N. Makasheva, S. Pyatenko, "United States-West Europe: Currency-Finance Conflicts. Causes and Consequences" (We Answer Readers' Questions) | 7 |
| T. Lavrovskaya, "Problems of the Economic Integration of the United States and Canada" | 8 |
| Yu. Savinov, "Clash of the Giants" | 3 |
| Internationalization of Capital. Currency-Finance Issues | |
| Yu. Yudanov, "Current Trends and Forms of the Internationalization of Production and Capital" | 1 |
| T. Belous, "Banking and Industrial Monopolies in the Structure of International Finance Capital" | 9 |

| | |
|---|----|
| V. Dyakin, "Means of International Settlements in the World Capitalist Economy" | 7 |
| R. Indzhikyan, "Export of Capital From the Oil-Exporting Countries" | 1 |
| V. Amirov, "Foreign Capital in Australia's Economy" | 2 |
| V. Fedorov, "The Deutschmark in the World Currency System" | 8 |
| V. Fedorov, "Luxembourg--International Finance Center" | 4 |
| I. Bubnov, "FRG Banks in the International Arena" | 7 |
| Ye. L'vova, "Spain in the International Movement of Capital" | 9 |
| L. Khudyakova, "The Transnational Banks and the Developing Countries" | 4 |
| N. Makasheva, S. Pyatenko, "United States--West Europe: Currency-Finance Conflicts. Causes and Consequences" (We Answer Readers' Questions) | 7 |
| A. Sharov, "Development of Working Capital Under the Conditions of Modern Capitalism" | 11 |

Problems and Contradictions of Scientific-Technical Progress

| | |
|---|---|
| V. Zubchaninov, "Contradictions of Technical Development in the Capitalist Countries" | 2 |
| B. Dobrovinskiy, S. Ul'yanichev, "Reorganization of the Structure of the Japanese Economy and its Scientific-Technical Support" | 5 |
| Ye. Lebedeva, "Bioengineering Industry in the United States: Development Prospects" | 1 |
| V. Lyubimova, N. Ivanov, "Microelectronics and Problems of Employment" | 4 |
| I. Sheyman, "Labor Efficiency in the Services Sphere" | 3 |
| V. Kondrat'yev, "Problems of Construction Efficiency--Investment Aspect" | 5 |
| N. Krichigina, "Energy Savings in the West European Countries" | 8 |

Critique of Bourgeois Ideology

| | |
|---|----|
| New Processes in Bourgeois Political Economy (Critical Analysis) (MEMO Roundtable) | 2 |
| A. Galkin, "Social Structure in the Interpretation of Bourgeois Social Science" | 4 |
| A. Galkin, "Leap in the Dark or Intellectual Amusements of Professor [Turen]" | 9 |
| S. Nikitin, "Inflation and Monetarism" | 8 |
| I. Osadchaya, "Theoretical Platform of Modern Conservatism in the United States" | 7 |
| E. Kuz'min, "The USSR Constitution and its Bourgeois Falsifiers" | 10 |
| K. Val'tukh, "Theory of Value: Foundation of Economic Science" | 5 |
| V. Zarin, "Institutional-Social Direction of Bourgeois Political Economy" | 1 |
| K. Luft, Ye. Stepanova, "Socialist Economic Integration and its Bourgeois Critics" | 4 |
| V. Pan'kov, "Contemporary Economic Thought in the FRG" | 9 |
| Ye. Rybkin, I. Tyulin, S. Kortunov, "Anatomy of a Bourgeois Myth" | 8 |
| V. Usoskin, "The Monetarist School in Bourgeois Political Economy: Sources, Evolution, Prospects" | 6 |

International Relations and Foreign Policy

| | |
|--|-------------|
| "High Responsibility for the Fate of Peace" | 1 |
| "Policy of Prudence and Peace" | 7 |
| V. Zagladin, "The Great October and the Two Directions in World Politics" | 11 |
| S. Tikhvinskiy, "Lenin, Genoa and Contemporaneity" | 4 |
| Ye. Primakov, "The Emergent Countries in International Relations" | 5 |
| V. Petrovskiy, "Disarmament and the Groundlessness of the Contrivances of its Opponents" | 6 |
| V. Petrovskiy, "Lenin's Concept of Disarmament in Action" | 10 |
| Yu. Rakhmaninov, "Europe at a Crucial Frontier" | 8 |
| G. Vorontsov, "Europe: Washington's Intrigues and the Imperatives of Security" | 12 |
| Scholars of the Socialist Countries on European Security and Cooperation | 1 |
| S. Madzoyevskiy, D. Tomashevskiy, "The Growth of International Tension and West Europe" | 11 |
| Yu. Tomilin, "Saving Mankind From the Threat of War--Duty of the United Nations" | 1 |
| At the UN General Assembly Second Special Disarmament Session | 8 |
| A. Svetlov, "New Stage in the Nuclear Arms Race" | 11 |
| S. Stashevskiy, G. Stakh, "Space Must Be Peaceful" | 2 |
| Ye. Tarabrin, "Africa in Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 2 |
| A. Glinkin, P. Yakovlev, "Latin America in Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 10 |
| R. Borisov, "The Near East in American Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 11 |
| A. Astaf'yev, A. Nikonov, "U.S. Militarism--Threat to Peace" | 3 |
| V. Linnik, "United States: Imperial Ambitions and Reality" | 10 |
| V. Laptev, "The 'China Factor' in the Policy of American Imperialism" | 1 |
| I. Vanin, "Imperialist Policy on the Oceans" | 3 |
| L. Lyubimov, I. Gorev, "The Oceans: New Legal Procedure in the Interests of Peace and Cooperation" | 9 |
| Ye. Rybkin, I. Tyulin, S. Kortunov, "Anatomy of a Bourgeois Myth" | 8 |
| T. Alekseyeva, Yu. Fedorov, "Imperialist Threat to the Persian Gulf" | 6 |
| V. Babak, "The American-Israeli Strategic Alliance and Annexation of the Golan Heights" | 2 |
| Yu. Barsegov, I. Imnadze, "The Falkland Islands (Malvinas): Old Dispute Under New Conditions" | 6 |
| G. Yevgen'yev, I. Mel'nikov, "Vienna: Constructive Results Needed" | 7 |
| V. Lukov, A. Zagorskiy, "The White House Against the 'Project of the Century'" | 3 |
| V. Misharin, "Quarter of a Century of the IAEA" | 9 |
| A. Pavlov, "Israeli Terrorism and its Patrons" | 6 |
| E. Ryabtsev, "Curbing the Aggressor in the Name of Peace in the Near East" | 9 |
| T. Alekseyeva, Yu. Alekseyev, V. Babak, V. Vladimirov, A. Kokeyev, M. Kubeyev, Yu. Oleshchuk, Yu. Fedorov, "Current Problems of World Politics (International Survey)" | 1, 4, 7, 10 |

Domestic Policy Processes Abroad

| | |
|--|----|
| "New Stage of the Antiwar Struggle in West Europe" | 1 |
| V. Azhayeva, "Prospects of the Anti-Imperialist Struggle and Canada's New Democracy Party" | 12 |
| S. Andreyev, "Greece--First Steps on the Way to Changes" | 3 |
| V. Baranovskiy, "Political Problems of the Integration Process in West Europe" | 6 |
| I. Gorodetskaya, "A Policy Fraught With New Explosions" | 4 |
| V. Iordanskiy, "Tropical Africa" Conflict of the Old and 'Modernism'" | 4 |
| L. Istyagin, "Neo-Nazism From Close Up" | 3 |
| V. Lyubimova, N. Ivanov, "Microelectronics and Problems of Employment" | 4 |
| S. Peregudov, "Arguments of the Left of the Labor Movement" | 1 |
| T. Pokatayeva, "Shifts in the Economy and Changes in the Social-Class Structure of the Developing Countries" | 7 |
| I. Timofeyev, "The Role of Islam in the Sociopolitical Life of Foreign Oriental Countries" | 5 |
| V. Fedorov, "Foreign Workers in the FRG" | 2 |

Economics and Politics of Individual Countries and Regions

West Europe

| | |
|---|--------|
| New Stage of the Antiwar Struggle in West Europe (Exchange of Opinions) | 1 |
| Problems of West European Integration (MEMO Roundtable) | 11, 12 |
| S. Andreyev, "Greece--First Steps on the Way to Changes" | 3 |
| V. Baranovskiy, "Political Problems of the Integration Process in West Europe" | 6 |
| K. Borisova, "The Crisis in the EEC's Ferrous Metallurgy Continues" | 2 |
| I. Gorodetskaya, "A Policy Fraught With New Explosions" | 4 |
| L. Gradobitova, "Scandinavia and the Developing Countries" | 4 |
| L. Istyagin, "Neo-Nazism From Close Up" | 3 |
| A. Kudryavtsev, "France--Along the Path of Economic Transformations" | 7 |
| S. Madzoyevskiy, D. Tomashevskiy, "The Growth of International Tension and West Europe" | 11 |
| S. Ovaneseva, "New and Old in Great Britain's Near East Policy" | 2 |
| Yu. Rakhmaninov, "Europe at a Crucial Frontier" | 8 |
| S. Peregudov, "Arguments of the Left of the Labor Movement" | 1 |
| V. Fedorov, "The Deutschmark in the World Currency System" | 8 |
| V. Fedorov, "Certain Aspects of Militarization in the FRG" | 5 |
| V. Fedorov, "Foreign Workers in the FRG" | 5 |
| V. Fedorov, "Luxembourg--International Finance Center" | 4 |
| M. Schmidt, "The FRG in the Modern World" | 4 |
| Yu. Barsegov, L. Imnadze, "The Falkland Islands (Malvinas): Old Dispute Under New Conditions" | 6 |
| M. Belyayev, "Concentration and Monopolization in Great Britain" | 3 |
| I. Bubnov, "FRG Banks in the International Arena" | 7 |
| A. Volkov, "Sweden's Monopoly Groups" | 9 |
| G. Yevgen'yev, I. Mel'nikov, "Vienna: Constructive Results Needed" | 7 |
| N. Kirchigina, "Energy Savings in West European Countries" | 8 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Ye. I'vova, "Spain in the International Movement of Capital" | 9 |
| A. Petrov, "Problems of the EEC's Merchant Shipping" (We Answer Readers' Questions) | 3 |
| Yu. Shichkov, "The EEC in the Labyrinth of Reforms" | 5 |
| G. Vlasov, "The Credit Lyonnais Bank" | 3 |
| V. Presnyakov, "The USSR-France: New Vistas of Mutually Profitable Cooperation" | 3 |
| Scholars of the Socialist Countries on European Security and Cooperation | 1 |
| The United States and Canada | |
| V. Azahayeva, "Prospects of the Anti-Imperialist Struggle and Canada's New Democracy Party" | 12 |
| A. Anikin, "Second Year of Reaganomics" | 6 |
| A. Astanovich, "The State and U.S. Corporations Under the Conditions of the Scientific-Technical Revolution--Foreign Economic Aspect" | 4 |
| A. Astaf'yev, A. Nikonov, "U.S. Militarism--Threat to Peace" | 3 |
| A. Astaf'yev, "The Oceans in the Strategy of American Imperialism" | 8 |
| G. Vorontsov, "Europe: Washington's Intrigues and the Imperatives of Security" | 12 |
| L. Bagramov, "Behind the Facade of U.S. Food Aid" | 3 |
| K. Kozlova, "The Public Sector in the U.S. Economy" | 10 |
| T. Lavrovskaya, "Problems of the Economic Integration of the United States and Canada" | 8 |
| V. Laptev, "The 'China Factor' in the Policy of American Imperialism" | 1 |
| Ye. Lebedeva, "Bioengineering Industry in the United States: Development Prospects" | 1 |
| I. Lebedev, "Canada and Australia in the Modern World" | 9 |
| G. Naydenov, "Crisis of the Tax-Depreciation Regulation of the U.S. Economy" | 12 |
| V. Linnik, "United States: Imperial Ambitions and Reality" | 10 |
| A. Urnov, "The Washington-Pretoria Alliance and Africa" | 3 |
| R. Faramazyan, V. Borisov, "Economic Aspects of Reagan's Military Program" | 8 |
| Yu. Chizhov, "Where R. Reagan's Program Is Leading the American Economy" | 2 |
| T. Alekseyeva, Yu. Fedorov, "Imperialist Threat to the Persian Gulf" | 6 |
| V. Babak, "The American-Israeli Alliance and the Annexation of the Golan Heights" | 2 |
| L. Kapranova, "Problems of Contemporary Urbanization in the United States" | 4 |
| V. Lukov, A. Zagorskiy, "The White House Against the 'Project of the Century'" | 3 |
| V. Popov, "Inflation in Canada" | 10 |
| N. Makasheva, S. Pyatenko, "United States-West Europe: Currency-Finance Conflicts. Causes and Consequences" (We Answer Readers' Questions) | 7 |
| K. Mangushev, V. Mirol'yuhov, "U.S. 'Oil' Policy" (We Answer Readers' Questions) | 2 |

Japan, Australia

| | |
|---|---|
| R. Aliyev, "Japan: Trends Toward Militarization" | 4 |
| V. Amirov, "Foreign Capital in Australia's Economy" | 2 |
| B. Dobrovinskiy, S. Ul'yanichev, "Reorganization of the Structure of the Japanese Economy and its Scientific-Technical Support" | 6 |
| I. Lebedev, "Canada and Australia in the Modern World" | 9 |

History and Current Affairs

| | |
|---|----|
| L. Istyagin, "Neo-Nazism From Close Up" | 3 |
| L. Istyagin, "Fascism Is War" | 5 |
| S. Peregudov, "Arguments of the Left of the Labor Movement" | 1 |
| O. Ul'rikh, V. Sheynis, "Economic and Social Problems of the Oriental Developing Countries" | 12 |

The National Liberation Movement. Problems of Asian, African and Latin American Countries

| | |
|--|----|
| Ye. Primakov, "The Place of the Emergent Countries in the World Economy" | 3 |
| Ye. Primakov, "The Emergent Countries in International Relations" | 5 |
| G. Kim, "The Soviet Union and the National Liberation Movement" | 9 |
| L. Bagramov, "Behind the Facade of U.S. Food Aid" | 3 |
| A. Glinkin, P. Yakovlev, "Latin America in Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 10 |
| L. Goncharev, "Africa in the Struggle for a New International Economic Order" | 6 |
| R. Borisov, "The Near East and American Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 11 |
| V. Vasil'yev, "The Developing Countries in the System of the International Capitalist Division of Labor" | 11 |
| L. Gradobitova, "Scandinavia and the Developing Countries" | 1 |
| I. Zorina, "The Developing Countries in the Political Structure of the Modern World" | 8 |
| R. Indzhikyan, "Export of Capital From the Oil-Exporting Countries" | 1 |
| V. Iordanskiy, "Tropical Africa: Conflict of the Old and 'Modernism'" | 4 |
| N. Karagodin, "Ecological Problems of the Developing Countries" | 2 |
| S. Ovanesova, "New and Old in Great Britain's Near East Policy" | 2 |
| T. Pokatayeva, "Shifts in the Economy and Changes in the Social-Class Structure of the Developing Countries" | 7 |
| Ye. Tarabrin, "Africa in Imperialism's Global Strategy" | 2 |
| I. Timofeyev, "The Role of Islam in the Sociopolitical Life of Foreign Oriental Countries" | 5 |
| O. Ul'rikh, V. Sheynis, "Economic and Social Problems of the Oriental Developing Countries" | 12 |
| A. Urnov, "The Washington-Pretoria Alliance and Africa" | 3 |
| P. Khvoynik, "Complex Problems of Trade and Development" | 5 |
| A. El'yanov, "The Developing Countries: Raising of Requirements and Differentiation of Consumers" | 8 |
| M. Kun'shchikov, "National Monopoly Capital in the Asian Developing Countries" | 4 |

| | |
|---|----|
| I. Mirkina, "Social Progress in the Emergent States and the Mass Media" | 9 |
| I. Khristich, "The 'Collective Reliance on Our Own Forces' Program" | 6 |
| I. Khudyakova, "The Transnational Banks and the Developing Countries" | 4 |
| The Capitalist and Developing Countries' Oil Trade (Statistics) | 10 |
| Scientific Life | |
| Scholars of the Socialist Countries on European Security and Cooperation | 1 |
| Symposium on Problems of World Economic Relations | 1 |
| V. Presnyakov, "USSR-France: New Vistas of Mutually Profitable Cooperation" | 3 |
| S. Asakura, honorary doctor of sciences of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations | 1 |
| A. Ognev, "The Activity of the Specialized Councils Under the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of World Economics and International Relations" | 5 |
| Criticism and Bibliography | |
| The Socialist World | |
| N. Vasetskiy, "Response to 'Critics'" (review of "The Soviet Constitution and the Myths of Sovietologists" by A.I. Luk'yanov, G.I. Denisov, E.L. Kuz'min and N.N. Razumovich) | 12 |
| K. Voronov, "Important Factor of Cooperation" (review of "What Is CEMA? Economics, Cooperation and Trade in East Europe" by Ye. Yensen and M. Niyel'sen) | 4 |
| I. Dudinskiy, "Characteristic of World Socialism" (review of "Rapprochement of the Socialist Countries. Questions of Theory and Practice" by B.M. Pugachev) | 5 |
| I. Korolev, "Important Aspect of the Study of the USSR's Foreign Economic Relations" (review of "Development of the International Division of Labor and Location of the USSR's Production Forces: Theory, Methods, Practice") | 10 |
| I. Nezinskiy, "Relations of the Socialist Countries: Problems of Theory" (review of "Socialist International Relations. Outline of a Systemic Study" by D.M. Fel'dman) | 6 |
| N. Petrakov, "Theory and Practice of Economic Growth Under Socialism" (review of "Socialist Expanded Reproduction. Questions of Economic Theory and Policy") | 7 |
| A. Umnov, "Good-Neighborliness, Friendship, Solidarity" (review of "The USSR and Afghanistan 1919-1981" by L.B. Teplinskiy) | 11 |
| O. Shabalina, "The CSSR: Improvement of the Structure of the National Economy" (review of "Long-Term Trends of the Development of the Structure of the CSSR's Economy: by V. Prukha and L. Kalinova) | 12 |
| V. Shastitko, "Important Economic Problem" (review of "International Production Systems" by Yu.S. Shiryayev) | 2 |
| Ye. Yakovleva, "Important Aspect of Business Relations" (review of "Legal Forms of the USSR's Scientific-Technical and Industrial-Economic Cooperation With the Capitalist Countries") | 3 |

Global Problems

- M. Bezdudnyy, "Problems of Capitalist Use of Resources" (review of "Resources and Development: Policy of Resource Use and Economic Development in an Interdependent World") 3
- G. Gornostayev, "Natural Resources and the Arms Race" (review of "Military Use of Natural Resources. Argument in Support of Conservation and Control" by Kh. Khvim and R. Malnes) 5
- Yu. Levin, "American Experts on Mineral Raw Material Supplies" (review of "World Trends in the Sphere of Mineral Raw Materials and Problems of Supplying the U.S. Economy") 7
- A. Suetin, "Important Aspects of the Ecology" (review of "Costs and Benefits of the Fight Against Sulphuric Acid Pollution. Procedural Study" and "Expenditure on Combating Pollutant Waste in Textile Industry") 6
- A. Suetin, "Class Limitation of Western Globalistics" (review of "The Global Future: Time To Act") 11
- G. Shakhnazarov, "Globalistics: Achievements and Tasks" (review of "Global Problems of the Present Day. Scientific and Social Aspects" by V.V. Zagladin and I.T. Frolov) 6

Economics of Capitalism

- Yu. Bobrakov, "American Capitalism and Marketing" (review of "Theory and Practice of Marketing in the United States" by N.Ye. Kapustina) 1
- F. Bromberg, "Disproportions of the Development of Japanese Power Engineering" (review of "Japan's Power Engineering: Economic Problems of Development" by S.S. Ul'yanichev) 12
- A. Bykov, "Technology Exchange: Contradictory Approach" (review of "East-West Technology Exchange" by [Yu. Zaleski, Kh. Vinert]) 3
- K. D'yachenko, "Under Crisis Conditions" (review of "The Contemporary Capitalist System: Deepening of Antagonisms") 7
- S. Yelekoyev, "Years of Hopes and Disappointments" (review of "America's Economy at the Transitional Stage") 4
- S. Zagladina, "What Lies Behind the Capitalist Health Care 'Boom'" (review of "Socioeconomic Problems of Capitalist Health Care" by I.M. Sheyman) 10
- A. Zagorskiy, "In the Search for a 'Balanced' Policy" (review of "The FRG's Relations With the Arab States. Problems and Factors Determining the New Orientation") 5
- N. Zaytsev, "The British Monopolies' Foreign Economic Expansion" (review of "British Business Giants: British Finance Capital in the World Arena" by S.B. Zelenev) 12
- D. Kuzin, "Economic Program Modeling" (review of "Organization of Program Control" by D. Davis, [A. Damb and R. Espeyo]) 3
- Ye. Lebedeva, P. Nedotko, "Program-Goal Management in the United States" (review of "The United States: Organization of National Programs") 2
- I. Makarov, "Truth and Inventions Concerning the Euromarkets" (review of "The Euromarkets and International Financial Policy" by D. Lomax and P. Cutman) 10

| | |
|---|----|
| L. Maksimova, "The Monopolies' Tax Policy" (review of "Economic Aspects of International Tax Avoidance" by B. Bracewell-Milnes) | 2 |
| S. Medvedkov, "U.S. Technological Expansion" (review of "American Capitalism and Technology Transfer ((International-Economic Aspects)))" by I.Ye. Artem'yev) | 1 |
| A. Mel'nikov, "United States: Sick Economy" (review of "Zero-Sum Society" by L. Turow) | 11 |
| A. Metropol'skiy, "Confessions and Prescriptions of an American Professor" (review of "America's Recovery. A Policy for Prosperity" by R. Mueller) | 3 |
| V. Romanova, "The Currency Crisis: Latest Aspects" (review of "Gold, the Dollar, Currency Crisis" by K. Kollokh) | 12 |
| G. Skorov, "Capitalism at the Start of the 1980's" (review of "New Trends in State-Monopoly Regulation of the Economy of the Main Capitalist Countries") | 1 |
| V. Studentsov, "Crisis of Great Britain's State Enterprise" (review of "The Nationalized Sectors: Policy and Activity Since 1968" by R. Prike and "Crisis of State Enterprise: Future of the Nationalized Sectors" by G. Redwood) | 9 |
| Ye. Chetyrkin, "Useful Aid for a Study of World Economic and International Relations" (review "Outlines of International Statistics. Methodology and Organization" by T.V. Ryabushkin and V.M. Simchera) | 10 |
| G. Chibrikov, "A Ship Losing Control" (review of "The Capitalist Economy Without a Compass" by Yu.V. Shishkov) | 6 |
| A. Shapiro, "Modern Capitalism and Foreign Trade" (review of "U.S. Corporations in the Struggle for Foreign Sales Markets" by E.V. Kirichenko and "Modern International Trade" by I.P. Faminskiy) | 9 |
| A. Sharov, "Fiasco of the Bretton Woods System" (review of "End of the Gold Standard" by T. Vylchev) | 1 |
| A. Shebanov, "West German Capitalism in the World Arena" (review of "Foreign Economic Strategy of the FRG Monopolies" by Yu.M. Krasnov) | 3 |
| V. Shchetinin, "The Scientific-Technical Revolution and Monopoly Expansion" (review of "In the Race for Superprofits ((Economic Strategy of the Monopolies in the World Arena Under the Conditions of the Scientific-Technical Revolution)))" by Yu.A. Savinov) | 2 |
| V. Shchetinin, "Incurable Ailment of the Capitalist System" (review of "Economic Crisis of Modern Capitalism ((Cyclical, Intermediate and Structural)))" by A.I. Bel'chuk) | 12 |
| R. Entov, "Contradictions in the Sphere of Capitalist Circulation" (review of "Capitalist Trade Today" by S.M. Zagladina) | 12 |

Critique of Bourgeois and Revisionist Ideology

| | |
|---|----|
| I. Aleshina, "Problems of the Young States and the Groundlessness of Bourgeois Ideology" (review of "Social Renewal: Outlines and Reality ((Critical Analysis of Bourgeois Concepts of the Modernization of the Developing Countries)))" by B.S. Starostin) | 12 |
|---|----|

| | |
|--|----|
| F. Burdzhakov, "Program of Antimonopoly Struggle" (review of "Away From Thatcherism. Alternative Economic Strategy" by S. Aaronovich) | 6 |
| N. Vasetskiy, "Response to 'Critics'" (review of "The Soviet Constitution and the Myths of Sovietologists" by A.I. Luk'yanov, G.I. Denisov, E.L. Kuz'min and N.N. Razumovich) | 12 |
| V. Granov, "The Immortality of Lenin's Thought" (review of "Against the Falsifiers of Leninism" by S.L. Titarenko) | 4 |
| V. Zarin, "American Institutionalism in the Search for New Concepts" (review of "Institutional Economic Theory. Contribution to the Development of a Holistic Economy") | 5 |
| N. Kolikov, "Topicality of Lenin's Legacy" (review of "Lenin As a Political Thinker") | 5 |
| V. Kortunov, "Uncompromising Struggle" (review of "International Relations and the Struggle of Ideas") | 11 |
| S. Pronin, "Fundamental Problems of the Capitalist Production Mode" (review of "Karl Marx's Great Discovery. The Methodological Role of the Teaching on the Dual Nature of Labor" by Vl. Afanas'yev) | 6 |
| A. Ryabov, "Against the Apologists of War" (review of "Philosophy of Aggression" by V.I. Zamkovoy and M.N. Filatov) | 11 |
| A. Sharkov, "Internationalism in Action" (review of "The Communists' International Unity: Historical Experience, Principles, Problems" by B.M. Leybzov) | 2 |

International Relations and Foreign Policy

| | |
|---|----|
| Yu. Babich, "Halting the Nuclear Race" (review of "Freeze! How You Can Help Prevent Nuclear War" by E. Kennedy and M. Hatfield) | 10 |
| M. Bezrukova, "Britain in the European Community" (review of "Britain in Europe" and "Power and Decision-Making in Europe. Political Institutions of the European Community" by S. Henig) | 2 |
| I. Blishchenko, "Important Sphere of Cooperation" (review of "Space and International Organizations" by Ye.P. Kamenetskaya) | 1 |
| O. Velichko, "Advantages of a Realistic Policy" (review of "Speeches" vols I and II by B. Kreisky) | 7 |
| L. Voronkov, "With a Policy of Consistent Struggle for Peace" (review of "International Yearbook. Politics and Economics. 1981 Edition") | 4 |
| A. Gorelova, "United States: Baseless Foreign Policy" (review of "Prosperity: Price of Survival Outline of American Foreign Policy" by J. Chase) | 9 |
| V. Davydov, "Under the Press of Militarism" (review of "The 3-Percent Solution and NATO's Future") | |
| L. Istyagin, "From Whom Europe Needs To Be Saved" (review of "Europe Between Confrontation and Cooperation. Problems of Detente for the 1980's") | 11 |
| G. Kolosov, "Against a Buildup of Nuclear Forces" (review of "How To Form One's Opinion About the Bomb" by R. [Neyld]) | 7 |
| V. Kortunova, "Uncompromising Struggle" (review of "International Relations and the Struggle of Ideas") | 11 |

| | |
|--|---|
| V. Lukov, "In the Spirit of 'Atlantism'" (review of "The Mediterranean Without the Greats" by [Sh. Zorgbib]) | 2 |
| V. Lukov, "Driving Forces of American Foreign Policy" (review of "United States: Behind the Facade of Global Policy (Domestic Factors of the Formation of the Foreign Policy of American Imperialism on the Threshold of the 1980's" by A.A. Kokoshin) | 6 |
| Sh. Sultanov, "The 'Third Way' for Washington" (review of "The Third Way. American View of Counterinsurgency Operations" by T. [Shekli]) | 7 |
| Yu. Tomilin, "Contradictory Policy" (review of "Nuclear Nonproliferation and U.S. Policy" by V.F. Davydov) | 7 |
| P. Cherkasov, "Trends of Atlantism" (review of "Defense Policy for France" by [F. Valanten] and "Defense Doctrine for France") | 1 |
| V. Emin, "Useful Book" (review of "International Nongovernment Organizations and Institutions. Handbook") | 9 |

Domestic Policy Processes Abroad

| | |
|--|----|
| M. Belyayev, G. Chelyuskina, "Britain Through the Eyes of a French Sociologist" (review of "This Unknown England. Changing Society" by M. [Sharlo]) | 1 |
| D. Bratslavskiy, "Monopolies and Monopolists: the Texas Robber Barons (review of "The Texas Rich. The Hunt Dynasty From the Inception of the Oil Industry to the Collapse of the Silver Market" by G. Hart) | 10 |
| I. Bunin, "Profound Shifts in the French Electorate" (review of "The French Left and the Vote for the Right") | 9 |
| V. Golosov, "Topical Problem of the Position of the Working Class Under the Conditions of State-Monopoly Capitalism" (review of "Monopolies and the Social Security of the U.S. Working People" by I.T. Nazarenko) | 10 |
| A. Ivakhnik, "Militarization of the Economy and the British Trade Unions" (review of "Impoverishment Through Arms: Risk to Jobs and Industrial Slump" by T. Webb) | 11 |
| I. Karaganova, "United States: Corporations and Politics (review of "U.S. Government and Politics") | 3 |
| N. Nazarova, "Social Structure of Modern France" (review of "The Petty Bourgeoisie in France" by [K. Bodelo, R. Estable and Zh. Mal'mor]) | 7 |
| G. Tsagolov, "Domination of the Plutocracy" (review of "Peter Newman. The Canadian Establishment") | 2 |

Problems of Asian, African and Latin American Countries

| | |
|---|----|
| I. Aleshina, "Problems of the Young States and the Groundlessness of Bourgeois Sociology" (review of "Social Renewal: Outlines and Reality ((Critical Analysis of Bourgeois Concepts of the Modernization of the Developing Countries))" by B.S. Starostin) | 12 |
| M. Vo'kov, "Problems of Latin American Industrialization" (review of "Industrial Development of the Latin American Countries Under the Conditions of the Scientific-Technical Revolution") | 9 |

| | |
|--|----|
| O. Vorkunov, "Role of the State in the Developing Countries" (review of "State Capitalism and the Social Evolution of Foreign Oriental Countries") | 1 |
| V. Gavril'yuk, "The 'Cultural Aggression' of the TNC (review of Transnational Corporations and Endogenous Development. Impact on Culture, Communications, Education, Science and Technology") | 12 |
| I. Yegorov, "The Developing Countries' Foreign Economic Strategy" (review of "The Group of 77. Multilateral Economic Diplomacy of the Developing Countries" by E.Ye. Obminskiy) | 7 |
| N. Zaytsev, "Mexican Scholars Criticize Washington's Policy (review of "The Reagan Administration... and the Boundaries of North American Hegemonism") | 5 |
| R. Kanelyushnikov, "Recommendations of an Indian Scientists" (review of "The Food Problem in India. Certain Aspects" by L. Ramachandran) | 1 |
| T. Mitina, I. Sysoyev, "The Transnational Banks and the Developing Countries" (review of "Multinational Banks the Low Level of Economic Development" by [M. Odl] and "The Transnational Banks: Transactions and Strategy and Their Consequences for the Developing Countries") | 10 |
| L. Fituni, "The Monopoly Bourgeoisie in the Emergent States" (review of "Asian Developing Countries: National Monopolies and Policy" by M.I. Kun'shchikov) | 10 |
| V. Shmelev, "North Africa: Results of Economic Development" (review of "Economy of the Maghreb Countries" by M. Vidyasova) | 9 |

Statistics

| | |
|--|------|
| Population of the Capitalist Countries | 2, 3 |
| The Oil Trade of the Capitalist and Developing Countries | 10 |
| Unemployment in the Capitalist Countries | 12 |

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1982.

8850

CSO: 1816/5

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

3-17-83
